## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 064 528 AA 001 007

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Wanger, Judith; Henderson, Mildred A. |
| TITLE | Evaluation Study of NCEC Information Analysis Products: Final Report. Volume II. Individual Document Evaluation Profiles. |
| INSTITUTION | System Development Corp., Falls Church, Va. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. |
| REPORT NO | TM-WD-5507 |
| PUB DATE | Jun 72 |
| CONTRACT | OEC-0-71-3709 |
| NOTE | 481p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$16.45 |
| DESCRIPTORS | Bibliographies; Data Sheets; Educational Resources; *Evaluation Methods; Information Utilization; *Literature Reviews; Professional Personnel; *Profile Evaluation; Publications; Reports; *Summative Evaluation; Surveys; *Use Studies |
| IDENTIFIERS | EMC Bibliographies; ERIC Clearinghouse Products; NCEC; PREP Reports |

ABSTRACT

Individual document evaluation profiles are reported in a three-page display for each of the 146 documents in the sample of NCEC information analysis products. The three pages are: (1) Title Page and Descriptive Data Report, (2) Reader (on 58 products) and Non-Reader Evaluation Data for: A. Practical Guidance Papers and Reviews, and B. Bibliographies, and (3) Specialists' Evaluation Data. A sample set of these standardized reporting formats is provided in exhibits, with accompanying explanatory notes. It is recommended that this volume be used only in conjunction with Volume 1 (see ED 064 527) so that the data may be interpreted in light of the survey methodology. (Author/DB)

ED064528

TM-WD-5507

# EVALUATION STUDY OF NCEC INFORMATION ANALYSIS PRODUCTS: FINAL REPORT

## VOLUME II

## INDIVIDUAL DOCUMENT EVALUATION PROFILES

AA001007

JUNE 1972

SDC
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
5827 Columbia Pike, Falls Church, Virginia 22041

# EVALUATION STUDY OF NCEC INFORMATION ANALYSIS PRODUCTS: FINAL REPORT

## VOLUME II

## Individual Document Evaluation Profiles

Judith Wanger

Mildred A. Henderson

June 1972

Education and Library Systems Department
System Development Corporation
Falls Church, Virginia

# NOTE

This volume is a supplement to the main report of this study, Volume I: Description of Study Methodology and Findings. Although data reported herein are of singular value, we do not believe that they can be interpreted meaningfully without the reader's full understanding of the survey methodology (its scope and limitations), which is reported in considerable detail in Volume I. Therefore, we recommend that this volume be used only in conjunction with Volume I.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION (from Volume I) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

A. NCEC INFORMATION ANALYSIS PRODUCTS . . . . . . . . . . . . . 2

ERIC Clearinghouse Products . . . . . . . . . . . . 2
PREP Reports . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 3
EMC Bibliographies . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 4

B. ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE STUDY . . . . . . . . . . . . 5

C. STUDY APPROACH . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 6

D. ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 8

II. INTRODUCTION TO THE "INDIVIDUAL DOCUMENT EVALUATION PROFILE" . . . 9

III. INDIVIDUAL DOCUMENT EVALUATION PROFILES . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 23

A. PREP REPORTS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 23

B. EMC BIBLIOGRAPHIES . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 53

C. ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE PRODUCTS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 67

## LIST OF EXHIBITS

Page

1. SAMPLE EVALUATION PROFILE COVER PAGE . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 10

2A. SAMPLE EVALUATION PROFILE PAGE FOR READER AND NON-READER DATA--FOR REVIEWS AND PRACTICAL GUIDANCE PAPERS . . . . . . . . . . . 12

2B. SAMPLE EVALUATION PROFILE PAGE FOR READER AND NON-READER DATA--FOR BIBLIOGRAPHIES . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 16

3. SAMPLE EVALUATION PROFILE PAGE FOR SPECIALISTS' DATA . . . . . . 20

# I. INTRODUCTION
(from Volume I)

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the quality and utility of NCEC information analysis products, including ERIC clearinghouse products, PREP reports, and EMC bibliographies.* This project was supported by the Office of Program Planning and Evaluation in the U.S. Office of Education (USOE), and was conducted over a 12-month period from July 1971 through June 1972.

As stipulated by USOE, the study was to focus only on the products, and not on the management process by which they were conceived and prepared. Within this limitation of scope, the planning and conduct of the study were guided by two major goals:

- To develop data from a cross-section of educators regarding their level of familiarity with, and judgments on the quality and utility of, NCEC information analysis products. Although based on specific documents, the data would be analyzed in relation to characteristics of both the user population and the documents so the results could assist USOE in developing policy-related guidelines for their future information analysis activities.
- To assess the SDC survey methodology so that a well founded plan for continuing evaluations of NCEC products could be recommended.

An outline of specific issues addressed in the study follows a brief discussion of the products and their originating units.

---

*These acronyms are used throughout the report:
NCEC: National Center for Educational Communication
ERIC: Educational Resources Information Center
PREP: Putting Research into Educational Practice
EMC: Educational Materials Center

## A. NCEC INFORMATION ANALYSIS PRODUCTS

The literature of research and practice is synthesized in three major types of NCEC information analysis products: ERIC clearinghouse products, EMC bibliographies, and PREP reports. A brief background on each of these product groups is provided in the following sections.

### 1. ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE PRODUCTS

Each of the 19 ERIC clearinghouses acquires, screens, indexes, and abstracts the published and unpublished literature in its respective content area. The products of these efforts are published in *Research in Education* and *Current Index to Journals in Education*. In addition, the clearinghouses produce a number of special information analysis products on subjects relevant to their scope of coverage. These products represent not only a range of product types (e.g., bibliographies and reviews), but a number of formats (e.g., newsletters and monographs) and dissemination media (e.g., journal articles and chapters in books). Adequate definition of "ERIC information analysis product," therefore, was a challenging part of the initial project work. Through a process of analysis and refinement, a decision was made to include three major types of products: bibliographies (citations only, citations with abstracts, and citations with annotations), reviews and state-of-the-art papers, and practical guidance papers.

The various special information analysis products have been prepared by the ERIC clearinghouses for the past 6 years. The steady growth of this program is illustrated in the yearly increments of publications cited in *ERIC Products*, an annual bibliographic publication of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Library and Information Sciences. These figures are:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1967-1968 | 149 citations |
| 1968-1969 | 240 citations |
| 1969-1970 | 366 citations |
| 1970-1971 | 416 citations |

Although some products are channeled through the professional journal literature, most of the products under study were originally available as monographs, for which initial press runs were made for clearinghouse distribution, followed by distribution through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS).

Each year, the clearinghouses submit budget plans to NCEC that outline the number and types of information analysis products proposed for the ensuing year. Approximately 40 to 45 percent of the total budget for each clearinghouse is for the information analysis program. The total NCEC budget for this program is approximately one million dollars.

## 2. PREP REPORTS

The Targeted Communications program of the NCEC's Division of Educational Extension Systems (formerly the Division of Practice Improvement) is the foundation for interpretive summaries called PREP reports. Projects are funded through contracts and grants to interpret research and development findings that have a potential for improving educational practice, particularly in USOE priority areas. The program specifies that the projects should be described in non-technical language and in such a way that they will meet the needs of specific, non-research audiences.

The actual PREP reports are created within NCEC as a byproduct of the Targeted Communications program. (The PREP report budget is a small fraction of the total budget for the Targeted Communication program.) Although these reports use much of the material--verbatim--from the final project reports, some formal or organizational changes are sometimes made. For example, a given project report may be repackaged into more than one PREP report.

To date, 30 PREP reports have been prepared. Approximately 300 copies of each are sent by USOE to state education agencies, who in turn have primary responsibility for distribution to appropriate target audiences. These reports are also made available through the U.S. Government Printing Office and the ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

Workshops and conferences for disseminating information are often a part of Targeted Communication projects. Originally, several workshops were to have been evaluated in this study. However, investigation revealed that evaluations had already been conducted on most of these workshops, by the sponsors, immediately following the workshops. Moreover, since considerable time had elapsed since the workshops had occurred, there was serious doubt that the participants would remember the workshop content or be able to identify its impact.

## 3. EMC BIBLIOGRAPHIES

Bibliographic reporting services provided by the Educational Materials Center (now a part of the expanded Educational Reference Center) draw upon a collection of approximately 16,000 textbooks, children's books, and professional education materials provided by publishers on a "permanent loan" basis. Most of this collection is housed at the Federal City College in Washington, D.C.

Over a period of 11 years, from the time it was the Educational Materials Laboratory, the Center has prepared 54 bibliographies. Although changes in formats have occurred over the years, the purpose has always been the same: to provide educators with bibliographic information on the particular materials in the Center's collection.

EMC bibliographies are distributed free by USOE and sold through the U.S. Government Printing Office.

## B. ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE STUDY

In its Request for Proposals, USOE identified a number of issues that needed to be addressed in the study. For each product in the sample, the study was to attempt to answer questions such as the following:

- Is the intended audience aware of the product's existence? How many have read it?
- How was it received by its intended audience?
- What is the quality of the product as perceived by intended users and others qualified to judge? What were its strengths and deficiencies?
- Did it accurately summarize and defensibly interpret the relevant literature?
- Do the bibliographies direct the user to the appropriate literature?
- How useful was the product to intended users? What use did they make of it (e.g., was it considered general information; was it used in solving a specific educational problem)?
- Did it satisfy user needs? What needs?
- Did the product reflect old, current, or original approaches to problems? Are the problems timely?
- What impacts can users report on practice as a result (even a partial one) of reading the publication?
- How do qualified experts rate the report as a contribution to information distillation of the educational literature?
- What were the "side-effects" of the document (e.g., use by persons other than the intended audience, utility other than intended, etc.)?

Each of these, and other related questions, were carefully considered in the design of the survey plan, particularly in the selection of survey participants and the development of survey instruments. Features of the SDC approach are summarized in the next section.

## C. STUDY APPROACH

The overall plan for the study was to obtain an appropriately large number of quality-utility judgments on NCEC products from a sample representative of the educational community. Features of the study plan are highlighted below:

- The Product Sample. A fairly large sample (146) of NCEC products was carefully selected to represent the major kinds of products and the major content areas.

- The Two Surveys. Two surveys were conducted:

  - A General Field Survey, representing a broad cross-section of educators, and

  - A Specialists' Survey involving individuals identified by their colleagues as being particularly well qualified to evaluate documents in the product sample.

  Participants for the General Field Survey were drawn in two ways:

  - A rigorous sample--the random sample--was drawn from personnel listings of state education agencies, local school districts, junior colleges, colleges/universities, and USOE-supported research facilities.

  - A second sample--the non-random sample--was drawn from several available listings, including ERIC Clearinghouse mailing lists, state and local educational information center user lists, and ERIC Document Reproduction Service on-demand sales records.

- The Survey Instruments. Four questionnaires were developed for the study:

  - A Screening Questionnaire (Q1) was mailed to participants in the General Field Survey to identify educators familiar with NCEC products. It included a special color insert of miniature photos of sample products.

- A User Evaluation Questionnaire (Q2) was mailed to a selected group of respondents to the Screening Questionnaire who had read or skimmed products from at least one NCEC unit. Participants were asked to evaluate 10 documents, each of which was individually assigned on the basis of Screening Questionnaire data. A document representation (i.e., title page, table of contents, and abstract or extract) was attached to each questionnaire.

- A Non-user Evaluation Questionnaire (Q3) was mailed to a selected group of respondents to the Screening Questionnaire who reported having not read or skimmed NCEC products. An abbreviated form of the User Evaluation Questionnaire was developed to explore non-users' potential interest in the documents. Procedures and packages comparable to those of the User Evaluation Questionnaire were used.

- A Specialists' Questionnaire (Q4) was mailed to selected specialists. Some questions were comparable to those of the User Evaluation Questionnaire, but explored the quality dimension in more depth. Documents were individually assigned and each specialist evaluated an average of two or three documents. Complete copies of documents were provided.

- Data Analysis. Data from the four questionnaires were analyzed to relate to each of the study issues and questions.

  Several kinds of survey findings are reported:

  - Evaluation data from Readers, Non-Readers, and Specialists are displayed in individual document evaluation profiles.

  - Evaluation data from Readers are aggregated on documents for each product type, subject area, and user group, as well as by level of product exposure and level of effort involved in the production of the product.

  - Non-reader and Non-user data are reported in the aggregate for documents in each product group.

  - Specialists data are reported for individual documents and, in the aggregate, for each of the three product types.

These and other special analyses are reported in one of two volumes of this report, as discussed in the next section on the organization of this report.

## D. ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

This study is reported in two volumes. Volume I describes the study objectives, reviews the survey methodology, and reports general findings and conclusions. As a supplement, Volume II contains the basic evaluation data, from Specialists, Readers, and Non-readers, on each of the 146 documents in the product sample.

The next chapter in Volume I is an executive summary that is written to provide an overview of the entire study in capsule form. Chapter III presents a detailed account of the survey methodology, from the development of the product sample through the conduct of the General Field and Specialists' Surveys. In Chapter IV, the respondent populations of these surveys are described by their various user characteristics.

Chapter V begins the reporting on survey findings with a presentation and discussion of data regarding the respondent populations' levels--both general and product-specific--of familiarity with NCEC information analysis products. A comparison of the two samples of the General Field Survey is made in Chapter VI, paving the way for the report in Chapter VII on the several aggregated data analyses. These analyses, and the conclusions and recommendations in Chapter VIII, are organized by study objectives and issues introduced in this Chapter.

Supplementary materials and tables are contained in several Appendices at the end of Volume I. The organization of Volume II is described next.

## II. INTRODUCTION TO THE "INDIVIDUAL DOCUMENT EVALUATION PROFILE"

Individual document evaluation profiles are reported in a three-page display for each of the 146 documents in the sample of NCEC information analysis products. These pages are:

1. Title Page and Descriptive Data Report
2. Reader[*] and Non-Reader Evaluation Data
   - A. for Practical Guidance Papers and Reviews
   - B. for Bibliographies
3. Specialists' Evaluation Data

A sample set of these standardized reporting formats is provided in Exhibits 1 through 3, with accompanying explanatory notes keyed to each element in the exhibits.

---

[*] Reader data are provided only on 58 products. For 50 documents, the sample size was 15 or more; in eight selected cases (i.e., selected to provide greater coverage of individual clearinghouses), the sample size was between 10 and 15.

EXHIBIT 1. SAMPLE EVALUATION PROFILE COVER PAGE

Ⓐ Document No. ① ②

③ NCEC Unit:

④ Product Type:

⑤ Subject Cluster:

⑥ Level of Effort Index:

⑦ Visibility Index:

---

Ⓑ GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= ①

**FAMILIARITY**

② _____% Previously Read/Skimmed _____% Only Heard About/Seen _____% Not Seen/Read

**RECENCY OF READING**

(N=

③ _____% Within past month

_____% Within past 3 months

_____% Within past 6 months

_____% More than 6 months ago

**COMMENTS**

④

---

Ⓒ SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N= ①

**RECENCY OF READING**

(N=

② _____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

**COMMENTS**

③

## Explanatory Note for Exhibit 1:

## SAMPLE EVALUATION PROFILE COVER PAGE

### A. DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION

1. Document No. SDC-assigned number.
2. Citation. Includes title, author, series (if any), date, and ED or GPO number.
3. NCEC Unit. Name of ERIC Clearinghouse.
   NCEC Product. PREP Report or EMC Bibliography.
4. Product Type. Review, Practical Guidance Paper, or Bibliography.
5. Subject Cluster. One of four general areas: Instructional Content, Educational Administration and Services; Special and Other Educational Groups, or Higher Education.
6. Level of Effort Index. High, Medium, or Low. (An asterisk indicates that no data were available and the median number of hours was assigned.)
7. Level of Visibility Index. High, Medium or Low. (An asterisk indicates that no data were available and the median number of copies was assigned.)

### B. GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (User Evaluation Questionnaire)

1. N. Number of respondents who reviewed the document.
2. Familiarity. Percentages of respondent population for each level of familiarity. ("Previously read/skimmed" group are hereafter called Readers, others Non-Readers.)
3. Recency of Reading. Percentages, within the Reader population, for each given time period.
4. Comments. Drawn from both Readers and Non-Readers. Reader comments usually made relative to the "usefulness" and "impact" questions; others are general observations. Non-Reader comments are generally "other" explanations why they did not read/skim a product they had heard about or seen. A Respondent's role/function, an abbreviation of one of the 15 general user groups, is underlined and precedes his comment.

### C. SPECIALISTS' SURVEY

1. N. Number of Specialists, either 2 or 3.
2. Recency of Reading. A background item. (Specialists were not expected to have read documents prior to receiving complete copies of documents to review.)
3. Comments. Drawn and synthesized from open-ended responses to quality-related items, plus any general comments. Each bullet represents a different Specialist.

EXHIBIT 2A: SAMPLE EVALUATION PROFILE PAGE FOR READER AND NON-READER DATA--FOR REVIEWS AND PRACTICAL GUIDANCE PAPERS

(Document (No.) continued)

Ⓐ **READER EVALUATIONS** (N=

**QUALITY**

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| ① Coverage | ___ | (___) |
| Up-to-dateness ② | ___ | (___) |
| ③ Organization | ___ | (___) |
| Writing ④ | ___ | (___) |
| ⑤ Format | ___ | (___) |
| Discussion ⑥ | ___ | (___) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| ⑦ Length: | | |
| About right | __% | (__%) |
| Too long | __% | (__%) |
| Too short | __% | (__%) |

**UTILITY**

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| ⑧ Relevance | ___ | (___) |
| Need ⑨ | ___ | (___) |
| ⑩ Comparative usefulness | ___ | (___) |
| Purpose of use: ⑪ | | |
| Obtain overview | ___ | (___) |
| Look up facts | ___ | (___) |
| Identify individuals | ___ | (___) |
| Identify relevant literature | ___ | (___) |
| Update knowledge | ___ | (___) |
| Obtain new knowledge | ___ | (___) |

⑫ **IMPACT**

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | __% | (__%) |
| Applied in my work | __% | (__%) |
| Used to give advice | __% | (__%) |
| Examined other documents | __% | (__%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | __% | (__%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | __% | (__%) |

Ⓑ **NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N=

**Utility**

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| ① Relevance | __% | __% | __% |
| ② Potential usefulness | __% | __% | __% |

③ **Reasons for not reading:**
(N=

_____% Could not readily obtain a copy
_____% Not sufficiently interested
_____% Lack of time
_____% Other

## Explanatory Note for Exhibit 2A:

## SAMPLE EVALUATION PROFILE PAGE FOR READER AND NON-READER DATA--FOR REVIEWS AND PRACTICAL GUIDANCE PAPERS

### A. READER EVALUATIONS

Means or percentages provided in the first columns are evaluation ratings by Readers for that particular document. The second column displays the Reference Mean or Percentage for each item, and represents the evaluation ratings for all documents within that product-type group (i.e., for Reviews or Practical Guidance Papers). Questionnaire items (and response choices where they are not given on the form) are provided below.

1. For your needs, how well did the document cover the topic(s)?
   ( ) Poorly ( ) Moderately well ( ) Very well
2. Do you feel that the material was up-to-date in its coverage of current research or practice, as of its publication date?
   ( ) No ( ) Could not judge ( ) Yes
3. The organization was:
   ( ) less than satisfactory ( ) satisfactory ( ) excellent
4. The writing was:
   ( ) hard to follow at times ( ) moderately clear ( ) very clear
5. The format (physical layout, illustrations, typography, etc.:
   ( ) hindered readability and understanding ( ) did not contribute to readability and understanding ( ) was very helpful to readability and understanding
6. The discussion was:
   ( ) inadequate for my purposes ( ) reasonably thoughtful ( ) very thoughtful
7. The document was: ( ) About right ( ) Too long ( ) Too short
8. How relevant was the topic to your general professional interests?
   ( ) Not at all relevant ( ) Somewhat relevant ( ) Relevant
9. As of the publication date, how great was your need for a good document on this topic?
   ( ) Not at all great; I had no special need for it.
   ( ) Moderately great; the topic is of continuing importance to me.
   ( ) Very great; I had an immediate need for a document on this topic.

10. In general, how would you compare this document with other documents of the same type?
    - ( ) Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.
    - ( ) It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
    - ( ) It is a very useful document.

    Please use the space provided below for any suggestions you have concerning the future preparation of documents of this type, or for elaboration on any of your responses above.

11. Documents can serve a variety of purposes and fulfill many different information needs for readers. In the following question, please indicate how useful the document was to you for each of the purposes listed. If you did not use the document for a stated purpose, check the last column.

12. As a result of reading the document, did you use the information or the document in any of the following ways?

## B. NON-READER EVALUATIONS

Questionnaire items and response choices (high to low) are provided below.

1. How relevant do you think this document might be to your general professional interests?
   ( ) Relevant ( ) Somewhat relevent ( ) Not at all relevent

2. As of the publication date, how great was your need for a good document of this type, on this topic?
    - ( ) Document would probably have been very useful.
    - ( ) Document would probably have been of some use.
    - ( ) Document would probably have been of little or no use.

3. If you knew about the document but did not read or skim it, what reason(s) do you remember?

EXHIBIT 2B: SAMPLE EVALUATION PROFILE PAGE FOR READER AND NON-READER DATA--FOR BIBLIOGRAPHIES

(Document (No.) continued)

Ⓐ

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean | | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ① Coverage | ____ | (____) | ⑥ No. of references: | __% | (__%) |
| Up-to-dateness ② | ____ | (____) | About right | __% | (__%) |
| ③ Organization | ____ | (____) | Too many | __% | (__%) |
| Format ④ | ____ | (____) | Too few | __% | (__%) |
| ⑤ Textual material | ____ | (____) | | | |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| ⑦ Relevance | ____ | (____) |
| Need ⑧ | ____ | (____) |
| ⑨ Comparative usefulness | ____ | (____) |

| ⑩ Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | __% | (__%) |
| To identify documents on particular projects | __% | (__%) |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | __% | (__%) |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | __% | (__%) |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | __% | (__%) |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | __% | (__%) |

IMPACT

⑪

Were cited documents examined? Yes __ ( %)

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

Ⓑ

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| ① Relevance | __% | __% | __% |
| ② Potential usefulness | __% | __% | __% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N= __)

③
_____% Could not readily obtain a copy
_____% Not sufficiently interested
_____% Lack of time
_____% Other

## Explanatory Note for Exhibit 2B:

## SAMPLE EVALUATION PROFILE PAGE FOR READER AND NON-READER DATA--FOR BIBLIOGRAPHIES

### A. READER EVALUATIONS

Means or percentages provided in the first columns are evaluation ratings by Readers for that particular document. The second column displays the Reference Mean or Percentage for each item, and represents the evaluation ratings for all documents within that product-type group (i.e., for Bibliographies). Questionnaire items (and response choices where they are not given on the form) are provided below.

1. For your needs, how well did the document cover the topic(s)?
   ( ) Poorly ( ) Moderately well ( ) Very well

2. Do you feel that the material was up-to-date in its coverage of current research or practice, as of its publication date?
   ( ) No ( ) Could not judge ( ) Yes

3. The classification or organization of entries (references) was:
   ( ) less than satisfactory ( ) satisfactory ( ) excellent

4. The format (physical layout and typography):
   ( ) hindered use ( ) did not contribute to its usability ( ) was very helpful to its usability

5. The textual material (annotations, abstracts, summaries, etc.) was:
   ( ) inadequate for my purposes ( ) moderately useful ( ) very useful

6. The number of references was: ( ) about right ( ) too many ( ) too few

7. How relevant was the topic to your general professional interests?
   ( ) Not at all relevant ( ) Somewhat relevant ( ) Relevant

8. As of the publication date, how great was your need for a good document on this topic?
   ( ) Not at all great; I had no special need for it.
   ( ) Moderately great; the topic is of continuing importance to me.
   ( ) Very great; I had an immediate need for a document on this topic.

9. In general, how would you compare this document with other documents of the same type?
   ( ) Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.
   ( ) It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
   ( ) It is a very useful document.

10. Bibliographies can serve a variety of purposes and fulfill many different information needs for users. In the following question, please indicate how you used the document. (Check as many as apply.)

11. As a result of using this document, did you examine any of the documents cited?
    ( ) Yes ( ) No
    If yes, was the content of the document what you had been led to expect by the content of the bibliographic reference?
    ( ) Yes ( ) No

## B. NON-READER EVALUATIONS

Questionnaire items and response choices (high to low) are provided below:

1. How relevant do you think this document might be to your general professional interests?
   ( ) Relevant ( ) Somewhat relevant ( ) Not at all relevant

2. As of the publication date, how great was your need for a good document of this type, on this topic?
   ( ) Document would probably have been of little or no use.
   ( ) Document would probably have been of some use.
   ( ) Document would probably have been very useful.

3. If you knew about the document but did not use it, what reason(s) do you remember?

## EXHIBIT 3. SAMPLE EVALUATION PROFILE PAGE FOR SPECIALISTS' DATA

**(Document _____ continued)**

**SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N= )**

① **QUALITY**

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | | | | | | |
| Choice of references | | | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | | | | | |
| Accuracy | | | | | | |
| Interpretation | | | | | | |
| Organization | | | | | | |
| Organization of references | | | | | | |
| Format | | | | | | |
| Writing | | | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?
Yes _____ No _____
If yes:

② Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | | | | |
| Look up facts | | | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | | | |
| Update knowledge | | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | | | |
| Other: ____________________ | | | | |
| ____________________ | | | | |

③ Need for Document of This Type

_____ Very great
_____ Moderately great
_____ Not at all great

④ Overall Usefulness of Document

_____ It is a very useful document.
_____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

## Explanatory Note for Exhibit 3:

## SAMPLE EVALUATION PROFILE PAGE FOR SPECIALISTS' DATA

This format reports more completely the response choices for each item since responses were simply tabulated. Means or percentages could not be used because of the small number of evaluations. Wherever questions or response choices are not clearly incorporated into the form, they are provided below.

1. Quality. Please rate the quality of the document in each of the following areas. If there are any outstanding strengths or weaknesses in an area that you feel should be considered in the preparation of future documents of this type, please use the comments section [after each item] to explain.

2. Utility. Would you recommend this document to your colleagues in the educational community? Yes ( ) No ( )

   If yes, for each of the purposes [given below] indicate how useful you believe it might be.

3. Need. As of the publication date, how great was the need in the field for a good document of this type on this topic?

   ( ) Very great; there was an immediate need for a document on this topic.
   ( ) Moderately great; the topic is of continuing importance in the field.
   ( ) Not at all great; there was no special need for it.

4. Comparative Usefulness. In general, how would you compare this document with other documents of the same type?

# III. INDIVIDUAL DOCUMENT EVALUATION PROFILES

## A. PREP REPORTS

Document No. 1. Treating Reading Difficulties: The Role of the Principal, Teacher, Specialist, Administrator. PREPS 2,3,4,5, Carl B. Smith, et al., 1970. (single edition from GPO: OE-30026; separate monographs: ED034 078, ED034 079, ED034 080, ED034 081)

NCEC Product: PREP Report

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper | Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content | Visibility Index: High

---

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=170)

FAMILIARITY

25 % Previously Read/Skimmed | 11 % Only Heard About/Seen | 64 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=43)

9 % Within past month | 21 % Within past 6 months

21 % Within past 3 months | 49 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Instr. Resources Spec: in responding to teachers' requests ,this and other PREP's most useful. . .generally received favorably by teachers and administrators. Other Admin: used in my work in new Title III reading project. Prog. Spec: used to document a term paper. Reading Spec: used during inservice sessions with teachers and administrators. Counselor: good references. Prog. Spec: used each separate part with appropriate groups. College Admin: has helped to improve my work a great deal. Researcher: documents of this type should be produced continually for educator awareness. Instr. Resources Spec: PREP's are excellent and timely. Reading Spec: well organized. Prog. Spec: purchased from IRA, not from ERIC. College Prof: IRA publication easier to handle and work with.

---

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=

RECENCY OF READING
(N=

_____ Within past month | _____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months | _____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

[See Documents 1A, 1B, 1C, and 1D]

(Document 1 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=43)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.49 | (2.43) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.77 | (2.77) |
| Organization | 2.35 | (2.33) |
| Writing | 2.49 | (2.53) |
| Format | 2.63 | (2.74) |
| Discussion | 2.30 | (2.30) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 77% | (83%) |
| Too long | 5% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 7% | ( 8%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.77 | (2.67) |
| Need | 2.44 | (2.35) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.63 | (2.52) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.58 | (2.54) |
| Look up facts | 2.23 | (2.24) |
| Identify individuals | 2.05 | (2.12) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.21 | (2.26) |
| Update knowledge | 2.53 | (2.41) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.09 | (2.18) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 19% | (23%) |
| Applied in my work | 67% | (65%) |
| Used to give advice | 58% | (49%) |
| Examined other documents | 16% | (27%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 5% | ( 6%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 56% | (50%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=108)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 62% | 27% | 10% |
| Potential usefulness | 55% | 30% | 14% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=19)

53 % Could not readily obtain a copy
26 % Not sufficiently interested
5 % Lack of time
11 % Other

Document No. 1A. Treating Reading Difficulties: Reading and the Home Environment The Principal's Responsibility.

NCEC Unit:

Product Type:

Subject Cluster:

Level of Effort Index:

Visibility Index:

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=

FAMILIARITY

_____% Previously Read/Skimmed _____% Only Heard About/Seen _____% Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=

_____% Within past month

_____% Within past 3 months

_____% Within past 6 months

_____% More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

2 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Helps to meet principals' needs for easy-to-read treatments about roles. Well organized; comprehensive; solid conclusions; authors well qualified. Includes samples of most appropriate references.

- Did not stick to topic "home environment"--much related to usual school programs. Useful ideas generated from descriptions of current programs. Topical organization of references would be better.

- Title and contents do not match well. Insufficient treatment of "home environment." Reference list incomplete. Page dealing with language of disadvantaged children filled with inaccuracies. Little that principal can "grab hold of". Organization not systematic.

(Document 1A continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Choice of references | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Accuracy | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Interpretation | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Organization | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Organization of references | | 2 | | | | 1 |
| Format | | 3 | | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?
Yes 1 No 2
If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 1 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

____ Very great
3 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

1 It is a very useful document.
____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
2 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 1B. Treating Reading Difficulties: Establishing Central Reading Clinics. The Administrator's Role.

NCEC Unit:

Product Type: Level of Effort Index:

Subject Cluster: Visibility Index:

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=

FAMILIARITY

_____% Previously Read/Skimmed _____% Only Heard About/Seen _____% Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=

_____% Within past month _____% Within past 6 months

_____% Within past 3 months _____% More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

_____ Within past month _____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months 2 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Presents only one side of issue...view traditional and presents little new. Floor plans of clinics not helpful. Author somwhat lacking in knowledge of administrators' role. Reference list limited...several useful references not included.

- Bibliography inadequate and incomplete. Could serve as excellent guide for administrators setting up clinics...very practical.

- Authors well qualified. References--good selection; not too long. Well organized. Style such that administrators likely to enjoy reading published version.

(Document 1B continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Organization | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Format | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ______

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | | 1 | |
| Other: ______________________ | | | | |
| ______________________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

______ Very great

3 Moderately great

______ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

______ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 1C. Treating Reading Difficulties: Correcting Reading Problems in the Classroom.

NCEC Unit:

Product Type: Level of Effort Index:

Subject Cluster: Visibility Index:

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=

FAMILIARITY

_____% Previously Read/Skimmed _____% Only Heard About/Seen _____% Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=

_____% Within past month _____% Within past 6 months

_____% Within past 3 months _____% More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

_____ Within past month _____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months 2 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Too much reliance on outdated (Strong, Austin), erroneous (Betts) studies. Some very obsolete and inaccurate notions of "language." Some excellent, though redundant, diagrams. Good emphasis on individualized correction program. Not enough practical teaching suggestions, as implied by title.

- Very practical and well written. Valid recommendation and conclusions.

- Quite traditional, added little new to already existing literature. Weakest section list of special instructional procedures...too brief to be helpful, did not tie in to any overall pattern. Topical rather than alphabetic listing of references much more useful to teachers. Floor plans of classrooms probably of limited value.

(Document 1C continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Interpretation | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Organization | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Organization of references | | 3 | | | | |
| Format | | | 3 | | | |
| Writing | | 3 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | | | |
| Other: ______________ | | | | |
| ______________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great

2 Moderately great

___ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

1 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 1D. Treating Reading Difficulties: Treating Reading Disabilities. The Specialist's Role.

NCEC Unit:

Product Type:

Subject Cluster:

Level of Effort Index:

Visibility Index:

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=

FAMILIARITY

_____% Previously Read/Skimmed _____% Only Heard About/Seen _____% Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=

_____% Within past month

_____% Within past 3 months

_____% Within past 6 months

_____% More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

__2__ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Well written; logical treatment; useful. Organization and variety good. Author well qualified.

- Lacked adequate research base. Too brief to be of any value to a specialist. A condensed version of traditional thinking on topic written about in many publications

- Lacks originality and specificity. Little attention to "How"...little practical help for treatment.

(Document 1D continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | | 3 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Accuracy | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Interpretation | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Organization | | 3 | | | | |
| Organization of references | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Format | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Writing | | 3 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 2 | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | | 2 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 2 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

____ Very great

3 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

1 It is a very useful document.

2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 2. Bilingual Education, Prep 6, Horacio Ulibarri, et al., 1969.
(ED 034 082)

NCEC Product: PREP Report

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper
Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups
Visibility Index: High

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=106)

### FAMILIARITY

18 % Previously Read/Skimmed
15 % Only Heard About/Seen
67 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=19)

21 % Within past month
21 % Within past 6 months
26 % Within past 3 months
32 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: Researcher: assisted in the establishment of bilingual reading program. Other Admin: need current information of projects across country made available on frequent basis. College Admin: not a typical PREP...others have not been useful...subject needs updating. Prog. Spec: degree of relevance has increased enormously since publication.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ Within past 3 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Very useful for those with little background. Main value clarity. Furnishes basis for further investigation.

- All authors from same institution...wider point of view would be helpful. Content geared to those with limited knowledge...more appropriate for teacher aids...needs much more depth and breadth. Some excellent resources missing. Put together too quickly to be of real value for any time period. Would be mistake to publish as new material.

- Undated; unable to tell who author(s) is...messy titling. One sided...many important points of view left out. Format tacky, jumbled. Too much jargon, sentimentality. Should make effort at uniform editions of publications.

(Document 2 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=19)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.42 | (2.43) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.58 | (2.77) |
| Organization | 2.26 | (2.33) |
| Writing | 2.47 | (2.53) |
| Format | 2.53 | (2.74) |
| Discussion | 2.26 | (2.30) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 79% | (83%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 21% | ( 8%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.63 | (2.67) |
| Need | 2.32 | (2.35) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.58 | (2.52) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.68 | (2.54) |
| Look up facts | 2.21 | (2.24) |
| Identify individuals | 2.11 | (2.12) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.16 | (2.26) |
| Update knowledge | 2.42 | (2.41) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.26 | (2.18) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 32% | (23%) |
| Applied in my work | 53% | (65%) |
| Used to give advice | 37% | (49%) |
| Examined other documents | 26% | (27%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 5% | ( 6%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 47% | (50%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=71)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 42% | 42% | 15% |
| Potential usefulness | 28% | 44% | 28% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=16)

25 % Could not readily obtain a copy

25 % Not sufficiently interested

25 % Lack of time

25 % Other

(Document 2 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | | 1 | | 2 | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | | 2 | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 |
| Interpretation | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Organization | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 |
| Organization of references | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 |
| Format | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 |
| Writing | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 1 No 2

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | | | |
| Update knowledge | | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | | | |
| Other: ______ | | | | |
| ______ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

2 Very great

1 Moderately great

___ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

1 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 3. Job-Oriented Education Programs for the Disadvantaged. Schools and Industry Cooperate. Prep 9, Trudy W. Banta, et al., 1969.
(ED 034 085)

NCEC Product: PREP Report

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: High

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=81)

FAMILIARITY

21 % Previously Read/Skimmed

17 % Only Heard About/Seen

62 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=17)

6 % Within past month

18 % Within past 3 months

29 % Within past 6 months

47 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Unclass: PREP's should be given wider dissemination. Researcher: helped me prepare for working with teachers on the state of the art in teaching disadvantaged.

NON-READERS: Instr. Resources Spec: didn't realize this title in series was available. Researcher: have only recently developed a need for it. Superintendent: at the time, I believed I was sufficiently familiar with the topic; it now appears that I was wrong.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Abuse of English language. Criteria not given for selection of content...a laundry list.

- Very useful with limited number of clients. Every school should have available. Clear communication...evaluations carefully drawn...recommendations clear and logical. Could serve to influence local businesses to inaugurate similar programs.

(Document 3 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=17)

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.41 | (2.43) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.82 | (2.77) |
| Organization | 2.29 | (2.33) |
| Writing | 2.24 | (2.53) |
| Format | 2.59 | (2.74) |
| Discussion | 2.18 | (2.30) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 100% | (83%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 0% | ( 8%) |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.59 | (2.67) |
| Need | 2.29 | (2.35) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.82 | (2.52) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.53 | (2.54) |
| Look up facts | 2.41 | (2.24) |
| Identify individuals | 2.12 | (2.12) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.29 | (2.26) |
| Update knowledge | 2.35 | (2.41) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.24 | (2.18) |

IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 24% | (23%) |
| Applied in my work | 71% | (65%) |
| Used to give advice | 53% | (49%) |
| Examined other documents | 33% | (27%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 6% | ( 6%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 53% | (50%) |

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=50)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 36% | 58% | 4% |
| Potential usefulness | 28% | 52% | 18% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=14)

21 % Could not readily obtain a copy
36 % Not sufficiently interested
21 % Lack of time
21 % Other

(Document 3 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | | | 1 | | |
| Choice of references | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Accuracy | 2 | | | 1 | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Organization of references | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 |
| Format | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | 2 | | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | 1 | | 1 |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____________________ | | | | |
| ____________________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

1 Very great

1 Moderately great

1 Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

1 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 4. Paraprofessional Aides in Education. Prep 12, Carl H. Rittenhouse, 1969. (ED 034 906)

NCEC Product: PREP Report

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: High

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 95)

### FAMILIARITY

23 % Previously Read/Skimmed

21 % Only Heard About/Seen

56 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 22)

18 % Within past month

27 % Within past 6 months

23 % Within past 3 months

32 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: Prog. Spec: made it available to every school and college in Nebraska. Other Admin: used as aid in writing proposal. Researcher: used to provide others with information relevant to them. College Prof: programs of mediocre quality included as no truly effective paraprofessional training programs developed yet. Supervisor: recommended to V.P. for consideration in staffing.

NON-READERS: Supervisor: just received it. Instr. Resources Spec: did not realize existed. Unclass: have referred it to others and rarely have copy for own use. Unclass: I like PREP's...would like to see broader distribution of clearinghouse products. Other Admin: quite good but not as up-to-date as Education USA 1972 publication.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

1 Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Good variety. Programs thoughtfully and clearly explained. Table of contents would facilitate usage. Many new federal programs not included. Format--rather crowded; no margins on some pages.
- Very good reference for early systematic efforts in training and utilizing teacher aides.

(Document 4 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=22)

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.45 | (2.43) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.82 | (2.77) |
| Organization | 2.41 | (2.33) |
| Writing | 2.64 | (2.53) |
| Format | 2.86 | (2.74) |
| Discussion | 2.27 | (2.30) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 95% | (83%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 0% | ( 8%) |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.68 | (2.67) |
| Need | 2.55 | (2.35) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.55 | (2.52) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.73 | (2.54) |
| Look up facts | 2.27 | (2.24) |
| Identify individuals | 2.09 | (2.12) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.23 | (2.26) |
| Update knowledge | 2.41 | (2.41) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.36 | (2.18) |

IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 32% | ( 23%) |
| Applied in my work | 55% | ( 65%) |
| Used to give advice | 45% | ( 49%) |
| Examined other documents | 23% | ( 27%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 5% | ( 6%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 55% | ( 50%) |

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 53)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 43% | 47% | 9% |
| Potential usefulness | 36% | 38% | 25% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N= 20)

| | |
|---|---|
| 35 % | Could not readily obtain a copy |
| 25 % | Not sufficiently interested |
| 10 % | Lack of time |
| 25 % | Other |

(Document 4 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 3 | | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | 3 | | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Organization of references | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Format | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | 3 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: _____ | | | | |
| _____ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

3 Very great

_____ Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

3 It is a very useful document.

_____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 5. Sharing Educational Services. Prep 13, Ray Jongeward and Fran Heesacker, 1969. (ED 036 666)

NCEC Product: PREP Report

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: High

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=107)

FAMILIARITY

15 % Previously Read/Skimmed

21 % Only Heard About/Seen

64 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING (N=16)

19 % Within past month

31 % Within past 6 months

25 % Within past 3 months

25 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Researcher: does not address itself to the most significant problem involved. Principal: used it for inservice staff training. Prog. Spec: used in writing a proposal...PREP is good publication. Researcher: difficut to obtain.

NON-READERS: Other Admin: assigned to other staff members. Researcher: too thick. Researcher: talked directly with principal researchers. Researcher: publicized its existence.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING (N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Well written, factually presented. Very helpful to educational institutions. Facts well interpreted.
- Would like to have known dates of implementation of each project. So brief, it is most useful as point of reference only, or for identification purposes. Interested in more information such as feasibility of projects.
- Would like to have seen more information sheets by Dr. Jongeward. NWREL has done a number of outstanding projects...this is another in keeping with that reputation.

(Document 5 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=16)

### QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.44 | (2.43) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.88 | (2.77) |
| Organization | 2.19 | (2.33) |
| Writing | 2.56 | (2.53) |
| Format | 2.81 | (2.74) |
| Discussion | 2.31 | (2.30) |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: |  |  |
| About right | 81% | (83%) |
| Too long | 6% | (4%) |
| Too short | 6% | (8%) |

### UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.75 | (2.67) |
| Need | 2.19 | (2.35) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.75 | (2.52) |
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| Obtain overview | 2.75 | (2.54) |
| Look up facts | 2.06 | (2.24) |
| Identify individuals | 2.06 | (2.12) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.38 | (2.26) |
| Update knowledge | 2.63 | (2.41) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.31 | (2.18) |

### IMPACT

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 25% | (23%) |
| Applied in my work | 81% | (65%) |
| Used to give advice | 63% | (49%) |
| Examined other documents | 31% | (27%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 25% | (6%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 69% | (50%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=69)

### Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 28% | 52% | 20% |
| Potential usefulness | 22% | 48% | 30% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=22)

23 % Could not readily obtain a copy

27 % Not sufficiently interested

14 % Lack of time

32 % Other

(Document 5 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | | | | 1 | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | | | | 1 | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | | 3 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 3 | | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | | 1 | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____________________ | | | | |
| ____________________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great

1 Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 6. Social Studies and the Disadvantaged. Prep 14.
Jonathon C. McLendon, et al., 1970. (ED 037 588)

NCEC Product: PREP Report

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: High

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 63)

FAMILIARITY

16 % Previously Read/Skimmed

13 % Only Heard About/Seen

71 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 10)

20 % Within past month

40 % Within past 6 months

20 % Within past 3 months

20 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Prog. Spec: made available to every school in state.

NON-READERS: Superintendent: forwarded to Department Head.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Author respected as social studies educator. Excellent, relevant topic. More specific footnotes needed. Lacks bibliography...author's name and date do not constitute a useful reference. Section introductions present key questions or outline major ideas to be covered--helps in reading a very unattrative manuscript. Many paragraphs too long. Broad research, clear conclusions, specific recommendations most valuable aspects of paper.

- Lack of detailed, preferrably annotated bibliography a serious failing. Writing clear but heavy and laborious. Content basically good and very timely. Paper falls down primarily because it is sometimes unnecessarily difficult to read (because of typography or language), sections not well coordinated, and some generalizations and implications not well supported. Latter not entirely author's fault since scope is broad and available research scant.

(Document 6 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=45)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 38% | 51% | 11% |
| Potential usefulness | 33% | 44% | 22% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=8)

13 % Could not readily obtain a copy

38 % Not sufficiently interested

38 % Lack of time

13 % Other

(Document 6 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 2 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| Choice of references | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| Organization of references | | | 2 | | | |
| Format | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Writing | | | 1 | 1 | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | | 1 | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 7  Individualized Instruction. Prep 16. Jack V. Edling, 1970. (ED 041 185)

NCEC Product: PREP Report

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper  Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services  Visibility Index: High

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=251)

### FAMILIARITY

30 % Previously Read/Skimmed  14 % Only Heard About/Seen  55 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING (N=76)

21 % Within past month

24 % Within past 3 months

22 % Within past 6 months

33 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: Superintendent: excellent. Other Admin: catalyst for others...are individualizing all areas in our school. Prog. Spec: made available to every school system in Nebraska. Supervisor: used in workshop...helped provide information for setting priorities. Instr. Resources Spec: more copies should be given to states...saved digging. Sec. Teacher: would like to see something similar for classroom teachers...gave support in what we are doing. Sec. Teacher: used in workshop for teachers. Researcher: tried to use it and couldn't...wanted theoretical perspective. Elem. Teacher: more concise report needed. Prog. Spec: like clear subdivisions...increased usefulness. NON-READERS: Other Admin: more up-to-date documents are available. Researcher: PREP's don't give enough information.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

### RECENCY OF READING (N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Well organized; well thought out. A little confusing format, maybe because a composite report. For school person interested in individualized instruction, document succeeds in meeting goals.

- Disorganized, sloppy writing; format bad. Unclear what project is about until well along in text. Only useful to pinpoint places to look for individualized instruction references...could be done in 5 or 10 pages and well summarized.

(Document 7 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=76)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.51 | (2.43) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.82 | (2.77) |
| Organization | 2.37 | (2.33) |
| Writing | 2.47 | (2.53) |
| Format | 2.74 | (2.74) |
| Discussion | 2.34 | (2.30) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 84% | (83%) |
| Too long | 7% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 5% | ( 8%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.76 | (2.67) |
| Need | 2.51 | (2.35) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.59 | (2.52) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.63 | (2.54) |
| Look up facts | 2.25 | (2.24) |
| Identify individuals | 2.09 | (2.12) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.30 | (2.26) |
| Update knowledge | 2.49 | (2.41) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.26 | (2.18) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 26% | (23%) |
| Applied in my work | 64% | (65%) |
| Used to give advice | 61% | (49%) |
| Examined other documents | 36% | (27%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 7% | ( 6%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 58% | (50%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=139)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 63% | 30% | 7% |
| Potential usefulness | 57% | 30% | 13% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=36)

42 % Could not readily obtain a copy
22 % Not sufficiently interested
8 % Lack of time
22 % Other

(Document 7 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | | | 1 | | |
| Organization | 1 | | | 1 | | |
| Organization of references | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Format | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Writing | 1 | | 1 | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 1 No 1

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | | | |
| Other: ______ | | | | |
| ______ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

2 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

1 It is a very useful document.

____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

## B. EMC BIBLIOGRAPHIES

Document No. 8. Books Related to English Language and Literature in Elementary and Secondary Schools, Lois B. Watt, Delia Goetz, and Caroline Stanley (Comp.), October 1969. (GPO: OE-30024; ED 039 236)

NCEC Product: EMC Bibliography

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Medium

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 197)

### FAMILIARITY

5 % Previously Read/Skimmed

13 % Only Heard About/Seen

83 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 9)

0 % Within past month

22 % Within past 6 months

22 % Within past 3 months

56 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: Reading Spec: provided stimulus and interest as well as knowledge enabling teacher to utilize creative writing with remedial reading youngsters. Principal: find it particularly helpful in helping give guidance to specific departments on curriculum improvement. College Prof: was limited in providing description I needed. NON-READERS: Instr. Resources Spec: have taken a reference from it. Instr. Resources Spec: have our own buying guide...this used for information. Supervisor: at time, was not involved in my present position. Prog. Spec: would need to be updated constantly to be of service for textbook adoptions. Prog. Spec: as a state consultant, did use for reference purposes. Instr. Resources Spec: would help to include LC number in Trade Books--Juvenile Literature--section for ordering purposes. Prog.Spec: review material only. Supervisor: impression that not detailed or analytical enough to be of much help.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Material very incomplete; many worthwhile texts not included. Trade books dealing with minority groups not adequately represented. Too many omissions to be considered comprehensive...too broad a range to be considered specialized.
- Too incomplete and unrepresentative to be very useful. If this is all of the books and materials EMC received during Jan. 1968 to Oct. 1969, they need better detectives as scouts.
- I have never read anything by these authors in the professional literature. Noticeable omissions of excellent language arts text books. Since based on EMC acquisitions, possible that better resources are not listed because publishers failed to send them? No excuse for very traditional topics under which language arts and reading texts are listed...forces omission of sources resulting from efforts to implement recommendations of the Dartmouth conference. Too much in one publication... one for elementary school resources and another with secondary far more realistic. Neither timely enough nor comprehensive enough to be particularly useful to curriculum people or for book selection.

(Document 8 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Purpose of use: | | |
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=163)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 46% | 36% | 18% |
| Potential usefulness | 34% | 42% | 23% |

Reasons for not reading: (N=25)

28 % Could not readily obtain a copy
16 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
52 % Other

(Document 8 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| Selection of content/material | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Choice of references | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 |
| Inclusion of current material | | | 1 | 2 | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Interpretation | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | |
| Organization | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Organization of references | | 3 | | | | |
| Format | | 3 | | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes _____ No 3

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | | | | |
| Look up facts | | | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | | | |
| Update knowledge | | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | | | |
| Other: ____________________ | | | | |
| ____________________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great

1 Moderately great

1 Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

_____ It is a very useful document.

2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 9. Science and Mathematics Books for Elementary and Secondary Schools, Lois B. Watt, Delia Goetz, and Eunice von Ende (Comp.), February 1970. (GPO: OE-29071;ED 041 760)

NCEC Product: EMC Bibliography

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 182)

FAMILIARITY

7 % Previously Read/Skimmed

13 % Only Heard About/Seen

80 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 12)

8 % Within past month

42 % Within past 6 months

8 % Within past 3 months

42 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

NON-READERS: Prog. Spec: unaware of content material breakdown. Unclass: sounds great. Researcher: budget limitations. Instr. Resources Spec: just came to my attention.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month

1 Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Well organized. Do not know compilers--assume they are well qualified for the job.

- Very limited coverage. A bibliography of detailed bibliographies in these fields, containing reliable analytical reviews would be more worthwhile.

- Some re-organization might have made bibliography more useful--"General Science" section a catch-all; several books in "History" section were not science histories. "Biology" section might have included subsection on microbiology etc. Could be longer.

(Document 9 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| No. of references: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ___% No ___%

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=146)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 44% | 38% | 16% |
| Potential usefulness | 34% | 38% | 23% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=24)

25 % Could not readily obtain a copy
29 % Not sufficiently interested
13 % Lack of time
29 % Other

(Document 9 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

## QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | | | | 2 | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Interpretation | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Organization of references | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 |
| Format | | 2 | | | | 1 |
| Writing | 1 | | 2 | | | |

## UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | | | 1 |
| Look up facts | 2 | | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | | |
| Other: ______ | | | | |
| ______ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great
2 Moderately great
___ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

1 It is a very useful document.
1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 10. Books Related to Adult Basic Education and Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages, Myra H. Thomas, Thelma M. Knuths, Sidney E. Murphy (Comp.), May 1970. (GPO: OE 13039; ED 043 850)

NCEC Product: EMC Bibliography

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 174)

FAMILIARITY

8 % Previously Read/Skimmed

20 % Only Heard About/Seen

72 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 14)

7 % Within past month

29 % Within past 6 months

14 % Within past 3 months

50 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: performs useful function in light of subject area limitations. Instr. Resources Spec: poor and misleading document...EMC did not have collection to support purpose of document...it was an inappropriate agency to produce it. Prog. Spec: needs more emphasis on student materials. Prog. Spec: more depth needed in abstracts. College Prof: add critical book review type comments to bibliography. Prog. spec: use in my role as instructional resource consultant.

NON-READERS: Prog. Spec: not presently doing work in area but am personally interested. Researcher: scanned for relevance for individual projects.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Glad to learn about this resource--not aware of its existence. This reconfirms my opinion that ERIC has to assume various dissemination roles. There should be some interpretation (e.g., evaluation, identification of audience for whom the resource was prepared, or statement of purpose). Exclusion of evaluative judgements by qualified persons is serious limitation.

- Clear categories; well organized; easy to read and understand. Would be more useful if it were an annotated bibliography. Should be published regularly (biannually or annually) to keep up-to-date.

- Inclusion of more available student materials would have increased value of document. Materials well organized in a very useable fashion.

(Document 10 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage |  |  |
| Up-to-dateness |  |  |
| Organization |  |  |
| Format |  |  |
| Textual material |  |  |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: |  |  |
| About right |  |  |
| Too many |  |  |
| Too few |  |  |

### UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance |  |  |
| Need |  |  |
| Comparative usefulness |  |  |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| To identify documents on particular topics |  |  |
| To identify documents on particular projects |  |  |
| To identify documents by particular individuals |  |  |
| To identify documents from particular institutions |  |  |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature |  |  |
| To see kinds of new work being reported |  |  |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=125)

Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 37% | 29% | 34% |
| Potential usefulness | 30% | 29% | 42% |

Reasons for not reading: (N=35)

34 % Could not readily obtain a copy
17 % Not sufficiently interested
3 % Lack of time
37 % Other

(Document 10 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 3 | | | | | |
| Interpretation | | | | 1 | 2 | |
| Organization | 1 | | | | 2 | |
| Organization of references | 3 | | | | | |
| Format | 3 | | | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Look up facts | 2 | | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Other: ____________________ | | | | |
| ____________________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

3 Very great

_____ Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

3 It is a very useful document.

_____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 11. Education Literature of the Profession, Eunice von Ende (Comp.), July 1970. (GPO: OE-10060-A; ED 046 890)

NCEC Product: EMC Bibliography

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 260)

FAMILIARITY

9 % Previously Read/Skimmed

14 % Only Heard About/Seen

77 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING (N= 23)

0 % Within past month

4 % Within past 3 months

39 % Within past 6 months

57 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Instr. Resources Spec: author index or combined analytical index would add to usefulness. Instr. Resources Spec: not particularly comprehensive for time period or for subject...have not found helpful. Other Admin: need annotations or reviews with annotations. Instr. Resources Spec: need annotations or scope notes...format is acceptable. Instr. Resources Spec: used to build teacher's professional collection.

NON-READERS: Prog. Spec: have many similar publications in library. Instr. Resources Spec: our service tries to put users in touch with more easily accessible materials. College Prof: only browsing at time. College Prof: keep as general reference.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING (N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Very valuable bibliography; very complete. Good organization.
- Well done.
- Almost impossible to evaluate--no statements of purpose intended audience, how books were acquired or criteria used to select items for entry. Any bibliography is useful (and this one is too) particularly when well organized, but has limited usefulness without short descriptions of entries.

(Document 11 continued)

**READER EVALUATIONS** (N=23)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.22 | (2.49) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.74 | (2.78) |
| Organization | 2.26 | (2.23) |
| Format | 2.70 | (2.72) |
| Textual material | 2.26 | (2.47) |

| No. of references: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| About right | 57% | (81%) |
| Too many | 9% | ( 4%) |
| Too few | 22% | (11%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.78 | (2.77) |
| Need | 2.30 | (2.39) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.65 | (2.70) |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | 65% | (73%) |
| To identify documents on particular projects | 22% | (41%) |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | 0% | (13%) |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | 9% | (11%) |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | 39% | (55%) |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | 61% | (67%) |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes 20 (87%)

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes 83 % No 17 %

**NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N=200)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 50% | 35% | 13% |
| Potential usefulness | 39% | 39% | 18% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=37)

41 % Could not readily obtain a copy
27 % Not sufficiently interested
8 % Lack of time
19 % Other

(Document 11 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | | | | 2 | |
| Choice of references | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 3 | | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | | | | 2 | |
| Interpretation | | | | | 3 | |
| Organization | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Format | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Writing | | | | 1 | 2 | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

| Purpose of Use | Usefulness for Various Purposes<br>Very Useful | <br>Somewhat Useful | <br>Not At All Useful | <br>No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | | 2 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | | 2 | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great
1 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

1 It is a very useful document.
2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

## C. ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE PRODUCTS

Document No. 12 Residential Adult Education: Current Information Sources, No. 25, October 1969. (ED 032 449)

NCEC Unit: Adult Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography
Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups
Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 65)

FAMILIARITY

23 % Previously Read/Skimmed
26 % Only Heard About/Seen
51 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 15)

0 % Within past month
33 % Within past 6 months
13 % Within past 3 months
53 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: extremely helpful in graduate studies in the education of adults. Instr. Resources Spec: contents not specific enough. Instr. Resources Spec: patrons have not requested copies of this.

NON-READERS: Supervisor: recommended to others for use in planning night high school. Researcher: Other reader informed me of use in private business.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ Within past 3 months
2 More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Now out of date. Cyril Honle's recent monograph for ERIC far superior to this and gives more information. Inadequate margins top and bottom; looks cheap and makes reading difficult; change of type is poor.
- No clear boundary. Many excellent sources omitted, some questionable items included. Pedestrian annotations. Very hard to read. Writing highly variable. Advances certain strands of influence and underplays others.
- Author very knowledgeable. Comprehensive, even intellectual in scope. A few references should not have been included...2 or 3 important works missing...on whole a good, well chosen reference list. Some print hard to read; some easy to read. Lack of index a major fault. Have found this series (Current Info. Series) to be one of the most helpful available...have used several...for many different purposes.

(Document 12 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=15)

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.60 | (2.49) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.87 | (2.78) |
| Organization | 2.20 | (2.23) |
| Format | 2.67 | (2.72) |
| Textual material | 2.47 | (2.47) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | 73% | (81%) |
| Too many | 7% | (4%) |
| Too few | 7% | (11%) |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.67 | (2.77) |
| Need | 2.27 | (2.39) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.73 | (2.70) |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | 80% | (73%) |
| To identify documents on particular projects | 53% | (41%) |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | 0% | (13%) |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | 0% | (11%) |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | 60% | (55%) |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | 73% | (67%) |

IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes 9 (60%)

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes 60 % No 40 %

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=33)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 30% | 45% | 24% |
| Potential usefulness | 15% | 42% | 36% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=17)

35 % Could not readily obtain a copy
47 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
18 % Other

(Document 12 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Format | | | | 3 | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | | 2 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | | 2 | |
| Other: ______________ | | | | |
| ______________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great

1 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

1 It is a very useful document.

2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 13 Physical Facilities in the Education and Training of Adults, Roger DeCrow, March 1970. (ED 036 677)

NCEC Unit: Adult Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=47)

### FAMILIARITY

11 % Previously Read/Skimmed

11 % Only Heard About/Seen

79 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 5)

40 % Within past month

20 % Within past 6 months

0 % Within past 3 months

40 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: helped in decision, planning adult learning systems. College Admin: timely...we need more. College Prof: used in developing a state-of-the-art paper.

NON-READERS: Researcher: had other priorities.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Of general academic interest but insufficient to build cases for local needs. Facilities for adult education will remain secondary until local community decides such education has value.

- There are more significant aspects of Continuing Education that need thorough study. If a study is needed to show there are few adult educational facilities and that this denotes second class citizenship this study has done that. Cannot get very excited about discussion of physical plant facilities; feel more learning takes place outside the walls of education than within...should concentrate on external influences.

- Selection of discussion material seemed haphazard. A real puzzle to me why this book should have been taken on by author.

(Document 13 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 37)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 35% | 49% | 16% |
| Potential usefulness | 32% | 43% | 24% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=5)

40 % Could not readily obtain a copy
40 % Not sufficiently interested
20 % Lack of time
0 % Other

(Document 13 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 |
| Selection of content/material | | 1 | | 2 | | |
| Choice of references | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 2 | | | | 1 |
| Accuracy | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Interpretation | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Organization | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Organization of references | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Format | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Writing | | 2 | 1 | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?
Yes 2 No 1
If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____ | | | | |
| ____ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

____ Very great
2 Moderately great
1 Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

____ It is a very useful document.
2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 14 A Handbook for Teachers of English to Non-English Speaking Adults, Patricia Heffernan-Cabrera, October 1969. (ED 033 335)

NCEC Unit: Adult Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: Medium

### GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=55)

FAMILIARITY

2 % Previously Read/Skimmed

15 % Only Heard About/Seen

84 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

0 % Within past month

100 % Within past 6 months

0 % Within past 3 months

0 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

### SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- One of the most useful documents ever read. Truly good guide. Tried some suggestions in teaching foreign students--marvelous!

- An excellent job in putting together information a TESOL teacher should have. Very accurate in explaining accepted techniques. Excellent document, well organized, covers subject well.

- Excellent, easy to use document for new teachers. More basic material and tests could be included in the bibliography. Author has fine understanding of academic and psychological needs of students.

(Document 14 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=46)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 26% | 41% | 33% |
| Potential usefulness | 26% | 24% | 50% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=8)

50 % Could not readily obtain a copy
0 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
25 % Other

(Document 14 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

## QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 3 | | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 3 | | | | | |
| Organization | 3 | | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | 3 | | | | | |
| Writing | 3 | | | | | |

## UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes _3_ No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 3 | | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 2 | | 1 |
| Update knowledge | 3 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 3 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 3 | | | |
| Other: Understand/provide for needs of TESOL students | 1 | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

_2_ Very great
_1_ Moderately great
_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

_2_ It is a very useful document.
_1_ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 15 Community Service and Continuing Education: A Literature Review, James B. Whipple, July 1970. (ED 038 550)

NCEC Unit: Adult Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Higher Education

Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 92)

FAMILIARITY

15 % Previously Read/Skimmed

10 % Only Heard About/Seen

75 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 14)

0 % Within past month

21 % Within past 6 months

29 % Within past 3 months

50 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: helped in providing technical assistance to several community colleges and university extension divisions. Prog. Spec: needs larger or more easily read print in body of text...better layout (more white space)...more analyis...a ready reference for cases and citations to discuss with program developers, systems planners, legislators.

NON-READERS: Researcher: have read only part of document. Prog. Spec: postponed getting to it till strong interest had past.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

2 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Disappointed that programs in community colleges hardly mentioned as they are the educational vehicle through which Title I can best be implemented.

- Some lines uneven; some typing errors; type a bit small. Repeatedly, references are made to the lack of many other documents which did not get into ERIC because of the voluntary nature of such offerings...this is an important problem on which to work.

- Limitation of sources to ERIC documents is recognized. Such publication needs to be updated periodically. Much to be gained by providing analysis of experimental programs such as Title I. Should facilitate adoption of successful ideas and techniques. Organization and flow of ideas and data easy to follow and comprehend. Margins too narrow; print size too small. Conclusions seem based on evidence.

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage |  |  |
| Up-to-dateness |  |  |
| Organization |  |  |
| Writing |  |  |
| Format |  |  |
| Discussion |  |  |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: |  |  |
| About right |  |  |
| Too long |  |  |
| Too short |  |  |

### UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance |  |  |
| Need |  |  |
| Comparative usefulness |  |  |
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| Obtain overview |  |  |
| Look up facts |  |  |
| Identify individuals |  |  |
| Identify relevant literature |  |  |
| Update knowledge |  |  |
| Obtain new knowledge |  |  |

### IMPACT

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision |  |  |
| Applied in my work |  |  |
| Used to give advice |  |  |
| Examined other documents |  |  |
| Consulted with author(s) or others |  |  |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) |  |  |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=69)

### Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 35% | 42% | 20% |
| Potential usefulness | 26% | 42% | 26% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=9)

0 % Could not readily obtain a copy

44 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

33 % Other

(Document 15 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | | | | | 1 |
| Selection of content/material | | 3 | | | | |
| Choice of references | | 3 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | | | 2 | | | 1 |
| Writing | 2 | | 1 | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 3 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

3 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

3 It is a very useful document.

____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 16 Education for Aging: A Review of Recent Literature,
H. Lee Jacobs, et al., July 1970. (ED 038 552)

NCEC Unit: Adult Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=33)

FAMILIARITY

24 % Previously Read/Skimmed
15 % Only Heard About/Seen
61 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=8)

25 % Within past month
25 % Within past 6 months
13 % Within past 3 months
38 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: used data to develop and plan residential institute. College Prof: would have preferred a more extensive and sophisticated discussion of literature.

NON-READERS: College Admin: loaned it to colleagues with specific interest in area. Instr. Resources Spec: no utilization need yet.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 6 months
1 Within past 3 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Does not clearly identify the most significant gaps in knowledge or practice and thus no desired leadership to future research or practice. Index to authors of studies cited in bibliographies would be helpful.

- Should include more recent references. Would have been helpful to have information about references listed for the first time.

- Bibliography for Chapter V incomplete...listed 46 but referred to additional documents up to number 64. Problems with margins, typographical errors.

**READER EVALUATIONS** (N=

### QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage |  |  |
| Up-to-dateness |  |  |
| Organization |  |  |
| Writing |  |  |
| Format |  |  |
| Discussion |  |  |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: |  |  |
| About right |  |  |
| Too long |  |  |
| Too short |  |  |

### UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance |  |  |
| Need |  |  |
| Comparative usefulness |  |  |
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| Obtain overview |  |  |
| Look up facts |  |  |
| Identify individuals |  |  |
| Identify relevant literature |  |  |
| Update knowledge |  |  |
| Obtain new knowledge |  |  |

### IMPACT

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision |  |  |
| Applied in my work |  |  |
| Used to give advice |  |  |
| Examined other documents |  |  |
| Consulted with author(s) or others |  |  |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) |  |  |

**NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N= 20)

### Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 55% | 25% | 20% |
| Potential usefulness | 45% | 20% | 35% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N= 5)

0 % Could not readily obtain a copy

40 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

40 % Other

(Document 16 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

## QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | | | | | 1 |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Organization of references | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 |
| Format | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Writing | | 3 | | | | |

## UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?
Yes 3 No ____
If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 3 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 3 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 2 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great
1 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

3 It is a very useful document.
____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 17 Needs--Of People and Their Communities--And the Adult Educator, Ernest E. McMahon, July 1970. (ED 038 551)

NCEC Unit: Adult Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 70)

FAMILIARITY

21 % Previously Read/Skimmed 4 % Only Heard About/Seen 74 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 15)

0 % Within past month 33 % Within past 6 months

27 % Within past 3 months 40 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: used document in developing research paper on motivating low-educational level adults to learn. College Prof: was used with very satisfactory results in graduate seminar. College Prof: useful in assisting students to distinguish between careful and careless use of word "needs" and concept it embraces. College Prof: very weak in analysis of substantive issues.

NON-READERS: Researcher: notified R&D director of document.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month _____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months 1 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Is excellent and important, but incomplete. Little attempt to analyze/interpret majority of items included in bibliography...topic categorization would have been useful. In final document (published by AEA), print too small. Subject treated more thoroughly in later document in the field...however, points made here remain important and are not emphasized in later one. Author states point of view and supports it with documentation rather than reviewing and interpreting the literature...latter needs to be done.

- Document takes adult educator beyond bricks and mortar and directly to people and programs.

- Readable and reasonably void of jargon which is refreshing. Heartily agree with authors emphasis on relevance. Higher education viability as an institution depends on its radical restructuring...no better place to begin than in areas author discusses.

(Document 17 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=15)

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.27 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.60 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.27 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.47 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.67 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 1.87 | (2.32) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 87% | (82%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 13% | (10%) |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.73 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.27 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.27 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.60 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.20 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.13 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.40 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.33 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.13 | (2.14) |

IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 7% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 73% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 27% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 27% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 0% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 53% | (46%) |

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 52)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 42% | 46% | 12% |
| Potential usefulness | 35% | 44% | 17% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N= 3)

67 % Could not readily obtain a copy
0 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
33 % Other

(Document 17 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

|  | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Selection of content/material |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Choice of references | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Inclusion of current material |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Interpretation | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Organization | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Organization of references | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Format | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Writing | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 |  |  |  |
| Look up facts | 2 |  | 1 |  |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 2 |  |  |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| Obtain new knowledge | 3 |  |  |  |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| Other: ____________ |  |  |  |  |
| ____________ |  |  |  |  |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great
1 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.
1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 18 Parent, Home and Family Life Education: Current Information Sources No. 30, July 1970. (ED 039 376)

NCEC Unit: Adult Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 73)

FAMILIARITY

3 % Previously Read/Skimmed

21 % Only Heard About/Seen

77 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING (N= 2)

0 % Within past month

0 % Within past 6 months

100 % Within past 3 months

0 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: this and similar documents are invaluable in developing R&D projects, in designing educational conferences, and in advising doctoral students.

NON-READERS: Supervisor: material was used by homemaking teacher in classroom. College Prof: recommended to relevant departments.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING (N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Variation in margins and many pages not numbered. Some annotations unclear. No annotation for some references. Some authors and dates omitted.

- Limited bibliography...some classic texts omitted.

- List of periodicals incomplete. More useful if it contained analysis/interpretation by one or two persons in the field.

(Document 18 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean | | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | | No. of references: | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | | About right | | |
| Organization | | | Too many | | |
| Format | | | Too few | | |
| Textual material | | | | | |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 56)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 45% | 39% | 16% |
| Potential usefulness | 41% | 38% | 21% |

Reasons for not reading: (N=15)

27 % Could not readily obtain a copy
27 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
47 % Other

(Document 18 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Choice of references | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Organization | | 3 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Format | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

3 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

3 It is a very useful document.

____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 19 The Preparation of Adult Educators: A Selected Review of the Literature in North America, Coolie Verner, et al., September 1970. (ED 041 180)

NCEC Unit: Adult Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Higher Education Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=51)

FAMILIARITY

22 % Previously Read/Skimmed 10 % Only Heard About/Seen 69 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=11)

0 % Within past month

36 % Within past 6 months

9 % Within past 3 months

55 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: used in adult educational class and seminar. College Prof: it pulled together many known and several not-known references...performed very useful summarizing and generalizing function. College Prof: used in advising researchers and in developing research design for improving professional training programs for adult educators. College Prof: given limited literature available, it was excellent...apparent inconsistency [in responses to 11 and 12] because had a great need for comprehensive study, and while document did not measure up, better than anything else available. Other Admin: have writers direct effort to specific concepts (i.e., to be used for presenting information to those in the field, giving an overview for those who know little, etc.) College Admin: not up to date; did not include own research directly relevant, completed a half-year before document published.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

1 Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- In some instances sources were not given. Only a few pages were numbered.

- Literature for the most part out-dated. Little on the undereducated adult...this could and must be developed. Clearly written; easy to read. Appears we are in great need of up-to-date literature for adult educators.

- Very useful document for persons involved in this area...less so for general adult educators. Choice of references good for material covered. Glaring omissions in material selected: inservice or continuing education of professional adult educators; pre-service education; and adult basic education.

(Document 19 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 35)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 40% | 40% | 20% |
| Potential usefulness | 23% | 43% | 34% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N= 5)

0 % Could not readily obtain a copy

20 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

20 % Other

(Document 19 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | | 3 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | | 2 | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 2 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 3 | | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great

1 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 20 Mass Media In Public Affairs Adult Education: A Review of the Literature, Hilton M. Power, November 1970. (ED 042 075)

NCEC Unit: Adult Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review
Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups
Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 66)

FAMILIARITY

11 % Previously Read/Skimmed
9 % Only Heard About/Seen
80 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 7)

0 % Within past month
0 % Within past 3 months
29 % Within past 6 months
71 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 3 months
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- No operational definitions of what author talks about. Most references old. Confuses methods and subject. Bibliography obsolete and no organization. Inaccurate typing. No conclusions or recommendations.

- Recent developments in CATV, EVR & cassettes not mentioned at all--understandably because of date of the publication; these areas of great concern to those in the field and should be developed in future publications on mass media.

- Document useful for bringing together body of survey research material, but material rather limited and no critical analysis. Avoids problem identification and suggesting areas of needed research...if these functions beyond purpose of such a review, then purpose should be re-examined...non-critical surveys essentially mindless exercises.

(Document 20 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=53)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 28% | 47% | 25% |
| Potential usefulness | 23% | 43% | 34% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=6)

0 % Could not readily obtain a copy

33 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

50 % Other

(Document 20 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Selection of content/material | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 1 | | 2 | | |
| Accuracy | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Interpretation | | 1 | | 2 | | |
| Organization | | 1 | | 2 | | |
| Organization of references | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Format | | | | 1 | 2 | |
| Writing | | | 2 | 1 | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 1 No 2

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 1 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great
1 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

____ It is a very useful document.
2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 21 Orientation Approaches to Increase Student Awareness of Occupational Options, Nancy Sloan, November 1969. (ED 033 255)

NCEC Unit: Counseling and Personnel Services Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography
Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content
Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=95)

FAMILIARITY

6 % Previously Read/Skimmed
16 % Only Heard About/Seen
78 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=6)

0 % Within past month
0 % Within past 6 months
33 % Within past 3 months
67 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Researcher: was helpful in research for developing a new project (CCEM).

NON-READERS: College Admin: primary concern is with occupational options of university students. Counselor: we have state program which provides material of this nature...a call will bring representative with all pertinent material to work with school.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

1 Within past month
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ Within past 3 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Paper needed an introduction describing organization and purpose. Very important document for school counselors.

- Helpful to have had initial statement of overall purpose and rationale. Poor format--no introduction, summary, or conclusion.

- Comprehensive; highly readable. ERIC is serving its purpose by providing documents of this nature, timeliness, quality, and general value.

(Document 21 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Purpose of use: | | |
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=74)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 50% | 38% | 9% |
| Potential usefulness | 36% | 42% | 20% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=15)

47 % Could not readily obtain a copy
33 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
7 % Other

(Document 21 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | | | |
| Other: | | | | |
| | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great
1 Moderately great
___ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.
1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
___ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 22 A Set of Generalizations and Implications...: Guidance and Student **Services for the Culturally Different**, G. R. Walz, D. K. Harrison, March 1970. (ED 037 596)

NCEC Unit: Counseling and Personnel Services Clearinghouse

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: Medium

---

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=100)

FAMILIARITY

13 % Previously Read/Skimmed

17 % Only Heard About/Seen

70 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=13)

8 % Within past month

15 % Within past 6 months

31 % Within past 3 months

46 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Prog. Spec: I work in a Mexican community on a volunteer basis...aided in understanding. Counselor: kept me aware of current studies and thoughts, but made it necessary to look further. Researcher: incorporated information and ideas into teaching structures. College Prof: small, rural community college doesn't face problems discussed in publication...may be fine for large urban areas.

---

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- We depend too much in guidance and counseling on these kinds of checklists--in lieu of thought! Much of the implication work really trite...much of the "writing" pretty obscure.

- Strength was ability to draw feasible implications. Very easy to read. Series useful for identifying poblems that culturally different people face adjusting to new situations. Implications, if implemented, could be of great value to the culturally different.

(Document 22 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=13)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.00 | (2.43) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.92 | (2.77) |
| Organization | 2.23 | (2.33) |
| Writing | 2.38 | (2.53) |
| Format | 2.69 | (2.74) |
| Discussion | 2.08 | (2.30) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 69% | (83%) |
| Too long | 8% | (4%) |
| Too short | 8% | (8%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.54 | (2.67) |
| Need | 2.15 | (2.35) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.31 | (2.52) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.54 | (2.54) |
| Look up facts | 2.00 | (2.24) |
| Identify individuals | 2.23 | (2.12) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.38 | (2.26) |
| Update knowledge | 2.46 | (2.41) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.23 | (2.18) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 31% | (23%) |
| Applied in my work | 69% | (65%) |
| Used to give advice | 38% | (49%) |
| Examined other documents | 23% | (27%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 0% | (6%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 77% | (50%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=70)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 47% | 47% | 6% |
| Potential usefulness | 46% | 41% | 11% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=17)

| | |
|---|---|
| 41 % | Could not readily obtain a copy |
| 29 % | Not sufficiently interested |
| 12 % | Lack of time |
| 6 % | Other |

(Document 22 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | | | | | 2 | |
| Inclusion of current material | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Accuracy | | | | | 2 | |
| Interpretation | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| Organization | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Organization of references | | | | | 2 | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Writing | 1 | | | 1 | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 1 No 1

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | | | |
| Look up facts | | | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | | | 1 | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | | 1 | |
| Update knowledge | | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | | | |
| Other: Identify new directions | 1 | | | |
| | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

____ Very great
2 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

____ It is a very useful document.
1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 23 Career Guidance Practices in School and Community, Lorraine S. Hansen, et al., 1970. (ED 037 595)

NCEC Unit: Counseling and Personnel Services Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Medium*

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=123)

FAMILIARITY

8 % Previously Read/Skimmed

16 % Only Heard About/Seen

75 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=11)

9 % Within past month

27 % Within past 6 months

9 % Within past 3 months

55 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Admin: I am a placement director...found helpful for my own information. College Prof: used as basic reference in graduate progam...great need for continuing publications of this nature...also updating of this material.

NON-READERS: Counselor: I may have skimmed it...very difficult to recall all these documents. Counselor: material not readily accessible and lack of time.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

1 Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- First-rate publication. Inputs excellent. Author, ERIC consultants, NVGA to be commended highly. Very comprehensive.

- Source material for document reported uncritically. Too much summarization of documents with no evaluation. Title implies coverage of community career guidance; primary emphasis was on public school.

- Well written, readable. Bibliographic references a strength of the document.

(Document 23 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N= 11)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.55 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 3.00 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.36 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.64 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.91 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.36 | (2.32) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 91% | (82%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 9% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.73 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.45 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.55 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.36 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.55 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.27 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.45 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.63 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.27 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 18% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 91% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 55% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 36% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 36% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 55% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=92)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 50% | 37% | 13% |
| Potential usefulness | 37% | 40% | 23% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N= 20)

40 % Could not readily obtain a copy
35 % Not sufficiently interested
5 % Lack of time
10 % Other

(Document 23 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | | | | | 1 |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | | | 1 | | |
| Organization | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 3 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____ | | | | |
| ____ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great

1 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 24 Recruiting the Hard-To-Employ, Personnel Services Review, Series 2, Perspectives on Training the Disadvantaged: The Hard-To-Employ, Don K. Harrison, May 1970. (ED 038 560)

NCEC Unit: Counseling and Personnel Services Clearinghouse

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=45)

FAMILIARITY

2 % Previously Read/Skimmed 7 % Only Heard About/Seen 91 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

0 % Within past month 0 % Within past 6 months

100 % Within past 3 months 0 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month _____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months _____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Superficial; too brief; overly repetitious of one or two or three ideas. Looks like a public relations brochure.

- Author did not do his homework. Several important omissions...references inadequate. Might be useful to small employer not having an employment specialist. There are better references for [representative efforts of] ERIC.

(Document 24 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=41)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 34% | 24% | 41% |
| Potential usefulness | 29% | 22% | 46% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=3)

0 % Could not readily obtain a copy
100 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
0 % Other

(Document 24 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| Selection of content/material | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Choice of references | | | | 2 | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Organization | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes _____ No 2

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | | | | |
| Look up facts | | | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | | | |
| Update knowledge | | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | | | |
| Other: ____________________ | | | | |
| ____________________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great

1 Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

_____ It is a very useful document.

_____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

2 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 25 The Hard-To-Employ--Who are they? Personnel Services Review, Series 2, Perspectives on Training the Disadvantaged: The Hard-To-Employ, D. K. Harrison & D. R. Brown, May 1970. (ED 038 559)

NCEC Unit: Counseling and Personnel Services Clearinghouse

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=36)

FAMILIARITY

6 % Previously Read/Skimmed

8 % Only Heard About/Seen

86 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

0 % Within past month

0 % Within past 3 months

0 % Within past 6 months

100 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall [No response = 1]

COMMENTS

- Very easy to read. Useful document for high school counselors as well as those mentioned.

- Biased report; lacks relationship to practice. Better quality documents of this nature are in normal consumer magazine. Unsubstantiated generalizations. Little attempt to relate generalizations to world of work. Easy to read. Topics clearly identified. Interpretation inaccurate in relationship to title.

- Presentation and interpretation clear and straightforward. Material easy to read. Provides working knowledge of the hard-to-employ.

(Document 25 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=31)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 29% | 48% | 23% |
| Potential usefulness | 32% | 32% | 35% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=3)

0 % Could not readily obtain a copy
33 % Not sufficiently interested
33 % Lack of time
0 % Other

(Document 25 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | | | | 1 | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Organization | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Format | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?
Yes 2 No 1
If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____ | | | | |
| ____ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

____ Very great
3 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.
____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 26 Innovations in the Training and Supervision of Counselors: Simulation Gaming, Personnel Services Review, Series 1, Susan F. Kersh, March 1970. (ED 036 671)

NCEC Unit: Counseling and Personnel Services Clearinghouse

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Higher Education

Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 69)

### FAMILIARITY

9 % Previously Read/Skimmed
10 % Only Heard About/Seen
81 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING

(N= 6)

17 % Within past month
0 % Within past 3 months
33 % Within past 6 months
50 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING

(N=1)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 3 months
1 Within past 6 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Accurate, but not specific or complete enough. Ideas needed clearer transitions. Could have explained many areas and games more completely. More references to be considered, such as micro-counseling and recall.

- Recommend it strongly. Outline format causes it to read a bit choppy.

- Authorship satisfactory but could have been more informed. Might have sought a little more outside review and input reaction before printing.

(Document 26 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=56)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 41% | 48% | 9% |
| Potential usefulness | 38% | 48% | 14% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=7)

29 % Could not readily obtain a copy

29 % Not sufficiently interested

14 % Lack of time

0 % Other

(Document 26 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Choice of references | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Organization | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Format | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: __________ | | | | |
| __________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

3 Very great

_____ Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 27 Innovations in the Training and Supervision of Counselors: Micro-Counseling, Personnel Services Review, Series 1, Juliet V. Miller, March 1970. (ED 036 672)

NCEC Unit: Counseling and Personnel Services Clearinghouse

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Higher Education

Visibility Index: Low

---

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=55)

FAMILIARITY

11 % Previously Read/Skimmed

13 % Only Heard About/Seen

76 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=6)

17 % Within past month

17 % Within past 3 months

17 % Within past 6 months

50 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Counselor: most of the material is excellent. Counselor: used for training aspects.

---

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Topic has appeal. Would be read by more professionals and trainees if authored by recognized leader in the field. Content rather narrow in scope. Bibliography not representative of work done on this topic in other areas of instruction. Enough to whet the appetite, but not thorough enough for broad use!
- A good springboard document that could get some started on further reading.
- Not an easy subject...the points were very clear. I believe every counselor educator should acquire this document.

(Document 27 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=42)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 48% | 45% | 7% |
| Potential usefulness | 45% | 38% | 14% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=7)

43 % Could not readily obtain a copy

0 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

14 % Other

(Document 27 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Organization | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 2 | | |
| Other: ________ | | | | |
| ________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great

1 Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 28 ERIC-IRCD Resources on the School Dropout, ERIC-IRCD Urban Disadvantaged Series, #14, Adelaide Jablonsky, April 1970. (ED 037 589)

NCEC Unit: Disadvantaged Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=40)

FAMILIARITY

7 % Previously Read/Skimmed    15 % Only Heard About/Seen    77 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=3)

0 % Within past month

33 % Within past 6 months

67 % Within past 3 months

0 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

NON-READERS: Unclass: have seen no reference to this one, although I know earlier documents on disadvantaged.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Some philosophic treatment of education for all would be useful addition. Status of Parkway Project of Philadelphia, Harlem Prep School of N.Y.C., and other experiments would be of interest.

- Good, solid job. Could have added a section contrasting reform school vs. reform student theses. Reference list a little pedestrian.

(Document 28 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ___% No ___%

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=31)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 48% | 45% | 6% |
| Potential usefulness | 26% | 65% | 10% |

Reasons for not reading: (N=6)

17 % Could not readily obtain a copy
50 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
0 % Other

(Document 28 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 1 | 1 | |
| Other: ____ | | | | |
| ____ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great

1 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 29 The Job Corps: A Review of the ERIC Literature, ERIC-IRCD Urban Disadvantaged Series, Number 13, Adelaide Jablonsky, March 1970. (ED 036 662)

NCEC Unit: Disadvantaged Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 44)

FAMILIARITY

9 % Previously Read/Skimmed
11 % Only Heard About/Seen
80 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING (N= 4)

0 % Within past month
0 % Within past 6 months
0 % Within past 3 months
100 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

NON-READERS: Counselor: the Job Corps program has not been well received in my area.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

RECENCY OF READING (N=0)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ Within past 3 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Only a temporary measure re the dropout problem.

- Critics underrepresented...one-sided. Annotation excellent, but no actual reviews of all manpower strategies.

(Document 29 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=35)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 14% | 49% | 37% |
| Potential usefulness | 17% | 31% | 46% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=5)

0 % Could not readily obtain a copy

80 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

20 % Other

(Document 29 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

## QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Selection of content/material | | 2 | | | | |
| Choice of references | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| Interpretation | | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | | 2 | | | | |
| Format | | 2 | | | | |
| Writing | | 2 | | | | |

## UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 1 | 1 | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

____ Very great
2 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

____ It is a very useful document.
2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 30 The Neighborhood Youth Corps: A Review of the ERIC Literature, ERIC-IRCD Urban Disadvantaged Series, Number 12, Adelaide Jablonsky, March 1970. (ED 036 661)

NCEC Unit: Disadvantaged Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=31)

### FAMILIARITY

3 % Previously Read/Skimmed

19 % Only Heard About/Seen

77 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

0 % Within past month

0 % Within past 6 months

0 % Within past 3 months

100 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- The NYC can only serve as a temporary measure.
- Solid job. Omits critical reviews of youth employment programs...not complete. Good annotations.

(Document 30 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Purpose of use: | | |
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ___% No ___%

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=24)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 21% | 46% | 33% |
| Potential usefulness | 17% | 21% | 63% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=6)

0 % Could not readily obtain a copy
50 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
17 % Other

(Document 30 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 2 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | | 2 | | | | |
| Choice of references | | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | | 2 | | | | |
| Format | | 2 | | | | |
| Writing | | 2 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____ | | | | |
| ____ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

____ Very great
2 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

____ It is a very useful document.
1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 31 School Dropout Programs: A Review of the ERIC Literature, ERIC-IRCD Urban Disadvantaged Series, Number 10, Adelaide Jablonsky. (ED 035 779)

NCEC Unit: Disadvantaged Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 36)

### FAMILIARITY

11 % Previously Read/Skimmed

11 % Only Heard About/Seen

78 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 4)

0 % Within past month

0 % Within past 3 months

50 % Within past 6 months

50 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

NON-READERS: Researcher: obtained for a person writing a project on Indian dropouts.
Prog. Spec: did not deal specifically with questions I had to answer.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Succinct, substantial. Slightly one-sided.
- Needed additional helpful content. Many listed programs phased out.

(Document 31 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=28)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 43% | 36% | 21% |
| Potential usefulness | 32% | 32% | 36% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=4)

50 % Could not readily obtain a copy

0 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

50 % Other

(Document 31 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | | 2 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | | 2 | | | | |
| Format | | 2 | | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 2 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great

1 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

____ It is a very useful document.

2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 32 The School Drop-out: A Review of ERIC Literature, ERIC-IRCD Urban Disadvantaged Series, Number 9, Adelaide Jablonsky, March 1970. (ED 035 778)

NCEC Unit: Disadvantaged Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 39)

FAMILIARITY

10 % Previously Read/Skimmed

26 % Only Heard About/Seen

64 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 4)

0 % Within past month

50 % Within past 6 months

25 % Within past 3 months

25 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Document makes a real contribution to store of knowledge dealing with school drop-outs across the country. Document useful alone or with the set.

- Dated. Could be more analytical.

(Document 32 continued)

**READER EVALUATIONS** (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

**NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N=25)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 60% | 36% | 4% |
| Potential usefulness | 44% | 52% | 4% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=10)

60 % Could not readily obtain a copy
10 % Not sufficiently interested
10 % Lack of time
10 % Other

(Document 32 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| Format | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

1 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 33 The School Dropout and the World of Work: A Review of the ERIC Literature, ERIC-IRCD Urban Disadvantaged Series, Number 11, Adelaide Jablonsky, March 1970. (ED 035 780)

NCEC Unit: Disadvantaged Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=64)

FAMILIARITY

8 % Previously Read/Skimmed
22 % Only Heard About/Seen
70 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=5)

20 % Within past month
60 % Within past 6 months
0 % Within past 3 months
20 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Unclass: used in connection with our own Title VIII project. Prog. Spec: need more and better reports.

NON-READERS: Instr. Resources Spec: did not have specific need. Vocational Educator: urban disadvantaged not realistic in Wyoming. Counselor: cost was prohibitive. Researcher: not in position to use, or to influence others.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ Within past 3 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Too skimpy. One-sided.

(Document 33 continued)

**READER EVALUATIONS** (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ___% No ___%

**NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N=45)

**Utility**

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 51% | 33% | 13% |
| Potential usefulness | 38% | 38% | 20% |

**Reasons for not reading:**
(N=14)

29 % Could not readily obtain a copy
21 % Not sufficiently interested
7 % Lack of time
43 % Other

(Document 33 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

## QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 2 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | | 2 | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Format | | 2 | | | | |
| Writing | | 2 | | | | |

## UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | 2 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 2 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

____ Very great
2 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

____ It is a very useful document.
2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 34 Immigrants and the Schools: A Review of Research, ERIC-IRCD Urban Disadvantaged Series, Number 8, David K. Cohen December 1969. (ED 033 263)

NCEC Unit: Disadvantaged Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: High

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 53)

FAMILIARITY

6 % Previously Read/Skimmed

2 % Only Heard About/Seen

92 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 3)

33 % Within past month

33 % Within past 6 months

33 % Within past 3 months

0 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: recommended to public school personnel in my graduate classes.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Interesting document. Relevant in light of IQ and achievement discrepancies between blacks and Anglos.

- Subtopic headings would have provided greater clarity. Good job of analyzing data used, but failure to interpret fully and relate findings to more recent and extensive sociological and social psychology materials. Thus, the implications seem not to be stated as emphatically as might have been.

- Document extremely useful though part of a larger whole which presumably by now appears elsewhere.

(Document 34 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=49)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 27% | 61% | 12% |
| Potential usefulness | 20% | 51% | 27% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=1)

0 % Could not readily obtain a copy

100 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

0 % Other

(Document 34 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization | 3 | | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 2 | 1 | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 2 | 1 | |
| Other: To place argument in historical context | 1 | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great
1 Moderately great
_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.
1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 35 Education, Ethnicity, Genetics, and Intelligence, IRCD Bulletin: Vol. 5, Number 4, Edmund W. Gordon (Ed.), Fall 1969. (ED 037 519)

NCEC Unit: Disadvantaged Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Level of Effort Index: Low

Visibility Index: High

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 128)

### FAMILIARITY

29 % Previously Read/Skimmed

10 % Only Heard About/Seen

61 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING (N= 37)

27 % Within past month

5 % Within past 3 months

11 % Within past 6 months

57 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: Researcher: subject continues to be very significant to my work. College Admin: used it as basis for helping teachers to analyze their behavior. College Admin: served to increase my interest in compensatory education. College Prof: influenced discussion and course work, particularly in "Theories of Instruction." College Prof: helped to clarify my opinions. Counselor: used in classroom. Special Educator: the one you have pictured looks far more relevant than one I received about a year ago. Researcher: somewhat biased...Pro-Jensen articles would have been helpful.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING (N=1)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

1 Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Content relevant and minus emotional rhetoric. Very interesting and useful, however, some references of historical nature were omitted.

- Articles should be concluded without continuing to later pages. Charts and drawings to explain some concepts might be added. Publication presents range of reactions. More focus on issues could have been obtained. Some redundancies in content.

- Total picture is fuzzy. Could have profited greatly from good editing, or from objective and concise editorial summary. Much prefer articles to be stacked back to back, rather than intermittantly continued on later pages. How appropriate for ERIC editor to prepare lead article, plus select reinforcing papers? His biases show as strongly as do those of the target.

(Document 35 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=37)

QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.57 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.81 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.40 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.57 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.78 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.49 | (2.32) |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: |  |  |
| About right | 86% | (82%) |
| Too long | 5% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 8% | (10%) |

UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.76 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.51 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.62 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| Obtain overview | 2.62 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.22 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.22 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.38 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.54 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.08 | (2.14) |

IMPACT

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 08% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 68% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 43% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 35% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 03% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 49% | (46%) |

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=78)

Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 44% | 44% | 13% |
| Potential usefulness | 33% | 44% | 23% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=13)

23 % Could not readily obtain a copy
15 % Not sufficiently interested
31 % Lack of time
15 % Other

(Document 35 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Choice of references | | 3 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | | | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Organization | 1 | | 2 | | | |
| Organization of references | | 3 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | 3 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | | 1 | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | | 2 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 1 | 2 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 1 | 2 | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great
1 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

1 It is a very useful document.
2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 36 Media for Teaching Afro-American Studies, IRCD Bulletin, Vol. 6, Nos. 1 and 2, Adelaide Jablonsky, Spring/Summer 1970.

NCEC Unit: Disadvantaged Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review
Level of Effort Index: High
Subject Cluster: Instructional Content
Visibility Index: High

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 74)

FAMILIARITY

19 % Previously Read/Skimmed
9 % Only Heard About/Seen
72 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 14)

14 % Within past month
29 % Within past 6 months
14 % Within past 3 months
43 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Researcher: good resource to have available...they have been useful in my work. College Prof: incorporated into courses taught and bibliographies used. College Prof: kept me abreast of developments and materials relevant to my writing in race relations. College Prof: in area of reading instruction, found it very helpful to both myself and my undergraduates...need this kind of material for future classroom teachers. Researcher: am encouraged to find a growing library of Afro-American materials; only meagre offerings previously available. College Prof: useful as resource for teacher educators and those in social science.

NON-READERS: Instr. Resources Spec: I have a good source of supply for this type of information. College Prof: have used other ERIC documents on same subject.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

____ Within past month
____ Within past 6 months
____ Within past 3 months
1 More than 6 months ago
____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Organization could be improved by arranging material according to some sort of sequence. Document should be helpful to educators who need to become aware of what media sources are available. Material not designated as historical should be updated.

- Use of black graduate students to critique media materials results in interesting interpretations which are thoughtful, if not unemotional. Not too many, and certainly not enough such reviews available. Material was quite timely and generally balanced.

(Document 36 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=53)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 28% | 49% | 23% |
| Potential usefulness | 25% | 42% | 34% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=7)

14 % Could not readily obtain a copy
29 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
29 % Other

(Document 36 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

## QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Organization of references | 2 | | | | 1 | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

## UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 3 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: Excellent critique of its own sources | 1 | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

3 Very great

_____ Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

3 It is a very useful document.

_____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 37 Significant Trends in Education of the Disadvantaged,
ERIC-IRCD Urban Disadvantaged Series, Number 17,
Edmund W. Gordon, August 1970. (ED 040 305)

NCEC Unit: Disadvantaged Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: High

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=145)

### FAMILIARITY

15 % Previously Read/Skimmed

10 % Only Heard About/Seen

74 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING (N=22)

14 % Within past month

18 % Within past 3 months

18 % Within past 6 months

50 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: I used some of the information to help me think through ideas about writing own paper on topic. College Prof: incorporated some information into courses taught. College Prof: reinforced ideas about the area.

NON-READERS: Prog. Spec: had already read Dr. Gordon's book. Prog. Spec: read some sections.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING (N=1)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

1 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Author a recognized authority in this field of endeavor. Material selected very much in forefront of discussion today in area of compensatory education. Selection of many outstanding papers and references in area of education for the disadvantaged most noteworthy. Lack, in presentation of ideas, of coherently weaving together a definitive conclusion.

- Discussion could have been expanded. Reader generally left to draw own conclusions. More discussion of points made and documented could improve paper considerably.

- Format--side heads would facilitate ease of reading. Very well done.

(Document 37 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=22)

### QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.41 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.64 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.32 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.45 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.64 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.36 | (2.32) |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: |  |  |
| About right | 77% | (82%) |
| Too long | 9% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 9% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.77 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.09 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.36 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| Obtain overview | 2.55 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.14 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.09 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.27 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.59 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.00 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 14% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 64% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 32% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 14% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 0% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 59% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=108)

### Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 49% | 41% | 10% |
| Potential usefulness | 40% | 44% | 15% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=15)

53 % Could not readily obtain a copy

13 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

13 % Other

(Document 37 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 3 | | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 3 | | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 3 | | | | | |
| Accuracy | 3 | | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | | 3 | | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 3 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 2 | | |
| Other: ____ | | | | |
| ____ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great
2 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.
1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 38 Mutability of Intelligence and Epidemiology of Mild Mental Retardation, ERIC-IRCD Urban Disadvantaged Series, Number 18, Zena Stein and Mervyn Susser, September 1970. (Reprint)

NCEC Unit: Disadvantaged Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: High

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=107)

FAMILIARITY

8 % Previously Read/Skimmed

10 % Only Heard About/Seen

81 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=9)

22 % Within past month

0 % Within past 3 months

33 % Within past 6 months

44 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

NON-READERS: College Prof: not teaching or researching in area at time and no students working on related topics. Researcher: this part of our project was handled by a psychologist. Researcher: limited literature budget.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

1 Within past 6 months

1 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- A most timely topic. Although authors both non-educators, have discussed a difficult subject in manner appropriate and useful for those seeking guidance and help.
- Omission of some significant references. Very useful document...highly recommend it.
- Very timely. Probably needs reinterpretation for laymen who tend to make policy.

(Document 38 continued)

**READER EVALUATIONS** (N=

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

**NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N= 87)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 40% | 41% | 18% |
| Potential usefulness | 32% | 43% | 25% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N= 11)

| | |
|---|---|
| 36 % | Could not readily obtain a copy |
| 18 % | Not sufficiently interested |
| 9 % | Lack of time |
| 36 % | Other |

(Document 38 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 3 | | | | | |
| Accuracy | 3 | | | | | |
| Interpretation | 3 | | | | | |
| Organization | 3 | | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Format | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 3 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 2 | | |
| Other: ____ | | | | |
| ____ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

3 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

3 It is a very useful document.

____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 39 Multi-Ethnic Books for Head Start Children: Black & Integrated Literature, Doris White, July 1969. (ED 031 312)

NCEC Unit: Early Childhood Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Medium*

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 151)

FAMILIARITY

9 % Previously Read/Skimmed 24 % Only Heard About/Seen 67 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 14)

21 % Within past month
21 % Within past 6 months
29 % Within past 3 months
29 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: useful reference...keep up-to-date for teachers. College Prof: should stay current. Supervisor: major concern art education...other publications of greater use to me...did use as secondary aid because of other agency assignments. College Prof: misleading title in some respects...includeded materials for children older than Head Start. College Prof: some confusion on part of reader in obtaining references...often cannot use microfilm and cannot locate mimeograph.

NON-READERS: Researcher: should have seen this document if the clearinghouse were operating effectively. Instr. Resources Spec: not a demand for this type of bibliography. Principal: could not readily obtain listed books. Elem. Teacher: had a great need to know of multi-ethnic cultures but was too busy...now am more aware and better able to use such articles. College Prof: lack of clerical assistance in ordering a copy. Researcher: black does not apply to our minority group.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ Within past 3 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Author appears particularly knowledgeable. Greater detail might help. Illustration detract from document. Writing concise, clear. Materials should be in children's classes and libraries. Should have documents for minority children other than blacks.

- Author limited in background. Question use of "Negro" instead of black in Preface. Wording in Preface and Introduction bland and full of superficial generalizations. Outdated and unsophisticated. Limit view. Title misleading--are texts for arithmetic, social studies, and music "literature?" Background adult materials very limited.

- Lacks depth of understanding of literary experience. Clear writing, if somewhat mundane. Includes most widely useable material. Annotations for recommended books useful.

(Document 39 continued)

**READER EVALUATIONS** (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Purpose of use: | | |
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

**NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N= 101)

**Utility**

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 45% | 41% | 13% |
| Potential usefulness | 36% | 40% | 23% |

**Reasons for not reading:**
(N= 36)

39 % Could not readily obtain a copy
11 % Not sufficiently interested
6 % Lack of time
36 % Other

(Document 39 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Interpretation | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Organization | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Format | | | 3 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | | |
| Other: ______ | | | | |
| ______ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great

1 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

1 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 40 Books in Preschool: A Guide to Selecting, Purchasing, and Using Children's Books, Louise Griffin, 1970. (ED 038 178)

NCEC Unit: Early Childhood Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper    Level of Effort Index: Medium*

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups    Visibility Index: High

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=213)

FAMILIARITY

9 % Previously Read/Skimmed    14 % Only Heard About/Seen    77 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=19)

11 % Within past month    26 % Within past 6 months

26 % Within past 3 months    37 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Unclass: useful in teacher training. Prog. Spec. article was helpful in training of project staff members in Title III project. College Prof: a great deal of useful material in this booklet, however, its lack of paragraph headings and captions are a limitation and prevent maximum use of excellent materials. College Prof: excellent at time...needs updating already. College Prof: outstanding resource of great reputation...referred others to document. Instr. Resources Spec: should be updated on all new and multi-sensory products in the area...document was used in Utah for evaluation purposes. Researcher: it actually contained several documents within one document...good.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month    _____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months    _____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Sketchy treatment of big topics. No clear-cut, fresh or original interpretation. Lay-out not at all appealing; seems amateurish. Mundane writing.

- Material particularly helpful to teachers and aids with limited backgrounds in children's literature. Author knowledgeable. Recommendations and conclusions stated simply and orderly. Document needed by many who work with young children. At times writer appears to be "talking down" to some readers--just right for many who need it.

- Format detracts considerably from useability and acceptance. Seems to have chatty "talkdown" flavor to interpretations. Very well thought out organization. Fine piece of work. Very useful to parent and practitioner.

(Document 40 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=19)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.53 | (2.43) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.79 | (2.77) |
| Organization | 2.42 | (2.33) |
| Writing | 2.74 | (2.53) |
| Format | 2.84 | (2.74) |
| Discussion | 2.47 | (2.30) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 89% | (83%) |
| Too long | 5% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 0% | ( 8%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.79 | (2.67) |
| Need | 2.63 | (2.35) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.53 | (2.52) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.63 | (2.54) |
| Look up facts | 2.47 | (2.24) |
| Identify individuals | 2.16 | (2.12) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.47 | (2.26) |
| Update knowledge | 2.68 | (2.41) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.11 | (2.18) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 42% | (23%) |
| Applied in my work | 79% | (65%) |
| Used to give advice | 58% | (49%) |
| Examined other documents | 26% | (27%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 0% | ( 6%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 53% | (50%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=164)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 54% | 27% | 18% |
| Potential usefulness | 78% | 48% | 36% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=30)

37 % Could not readily obtain a copy

27 % Not sufficiently interested

13 % Lack of time

20 % Other

(Document 40 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Format | | 1 | | 2 | | |
| Writing | | 2 | 1 | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 2 | | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 3 | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: ________________ | | | | |
| ________________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

2 Very great

1 Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

2 It is a very useful document.

_____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 41 Sentimentality in Preschool Teachers: Some Possible Interpretations, Lilian G. Katz, March 1970. (ED 035 792)

NCEC Unit: Early Childhood Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: Medium

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 159)

### FAMILIARITY

23 % Previously Read/Skimmed
16 % Only Heard About/Seen
62 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 36)

17 % Within past month
19 % Within past 3 months
22 % Within past 6 months
42 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: thought provoking articles of this nature are valuable resources for teachers. Reading Spec: useful materials for preschool aide trainees... provided thought provoking ideas...useful for self-evaluation. College Prof: clarified thinking in staff discussions of goals. Researcher: useful in teaching about "role of the teacher"...format section headings in bold or different type. College Prof: any material by author is useful...these short pieces are helpful... used in college classes to emphasize teacher personality influence. Special Educator: one of the best.

NON-READERS: Unclass: have not made an effort to keep up in this research field... my professional area is different. Researcher: I discussed paper with person who heard it presented.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month
1 Within past 3 months
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Needs more focus...appears to have been written to meet a paper reading requirement. Should have been rewritten, expanded for insertion in the system.

- References deal with somewhat "extreme" points of view...do not include points of view which have "updated" the traditional teacher's work (programs which utilize developmental views of Piaget). Would have been helpful to organize bibliography within categories presented by author. Value is historical.

- Thoughtful and competent contribution to the professional literature. Interpretations sound though speculative. Impetus for discussion among students and teachers in field.

(Document 41 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=36)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.50 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.75 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.31 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.58 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.67 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.44 | (2.32) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 83% | (82%) |
| Too long | 3% | ( 4%, |
| Too short | 3% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.56 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.11 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.56 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.50 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.08 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.08 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.19 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.44 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.17 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 11% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 58% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 39% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 19% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 11% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 42% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=98)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 52% | 34% | 14% |
| Potential usefulness | 41% | 38% | 20% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=25)

56 % Could not readily obtain a copy

20 % Not sufficiently interested

4 % Lack of time

8 % Other

(Document 41 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | | 2 | | | | 1 |
| Inclusion of current material | | 2 | | | | 1 |
| Accuracy | 1 | | 2 | | | |
| Interpretation | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 |
| Organization | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Organization of references | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
| Format | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Writing | | 2 | 1 | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | | 2 | | |
| Look up facts | | | 2 | |
| Identify relevant literature | | 1 | 1 | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | | 2 | |
| Update knowledge | | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 1 | 1 | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

_____ Very great

3 Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

1 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 42 ERIC Abstracts Series Number One: Collective Negotiations in Education, August 1969. (ED 035 978)

NCEC Unit: Educational Management Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Medium

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 49)

### FAMILIARITY

18 % Previously Read/Skimmed
33 % Only Heard About/Seen
49 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 9)

22 % Within past month
33 % Within past 6 months
11 % Within past 3 months
33 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READER: Instr. Resources Spec: as normal, another outstanding product from ERIC/EM.. suggest format be expanded to include a few books and periodical articles to supplement ERIC documents.

NON-READER: Prog. Spec: unaware of it at time. College Admin: perused it as a matter of general interest. Superintendent: had sufficient literature available. Supervisor: referred someone else to the document.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N= 3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 0)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ Within past 3 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- No real discrimination of either quality or categories covered. No system of organization of materials.

- Useful, well organized annotated bibliography.

- In many instances, content is very general and difficult to separate from "general administration."

(Document 42 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

## QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

## UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

## IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=24)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 38% | 25% | 38% |
| Potential usefulness | 29% | 25% | 46% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=16)

13 % Could not readily obtain a copy
38 % Not sufficiently interested
13 % Lack of time
25 % Other

(Document 42 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Selection of content/material | | 3 | | | | |
| Choice of references | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | | 3 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Format | | | 3 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | | 2 | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | | 1 | 2 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 3 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | | 3 | |
| Other: ________________ | | | | |
| ________________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great

1 Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 43 Annotated Bibliography on School-Community Relations, Kathleen O. Jackson, July 1969. (ED 030 220)

NCEC Unit: Educational Management Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 70)

FAMILIARITY

6 % Previously Read/Skimmed

23 % Only Heard About/Seen

71 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 4)

25 % Within past month

0 % Within past 3 months

0 % Within past 6 months

75 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Superintendent: not a complete search of the literature...could have been more thorough.

NON-READERS: Instr. Resources Spec: good bib, but I was familiar with more recent one which I consulted. Prog. Spec: professionally the area is of great interest, but my job description does not include this domain.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N= 3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 1)

____ Within past month

____ Within past 3 months

____ Within past 6 months

1 More than 6 months ago

____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Ideas organized and presented in logical sequence. Administrators would have greatest need for this material, consequently broader coverage of administrative activity in curricular and organizational action research related to community relations is needed. Author did creditable job, but was unfortunate victim of being the recipient of task which was outside field of experience.

- Content somewhat limited.

- Good on studies of schools done fairly recently. Short on classics and on non-education sources that could have theoretical application.

(Document 43 continued)

**READER EVALUATIONS** (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| No. of references: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

**NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N= 50)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 48% | 42% | 8% |
| Potential usefulness | 40% | 32% | 28% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N= 16)

25 % Could not readily obtain a copy
38 % Not sufficiently interested
6 % Lack of time
25 % Other

(Document 43 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Selection of content/material | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Choice of references | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | 3 | | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 |
| Format | | 3 | | | | |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 2 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | 3 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 2 | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 3 | | |
| Other: __________ | | | | |
| __________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great

2 Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

_____ It is a very useful document.

3 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

**Document No. 44** ERIC Abstracts No. 9: Educational Assessment, September 1970. (ED 044 770)

NCEC Unit: Educational Management Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Medium

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=128)

### FAMILIARITY

19 % Previously Read/Skimmed

22 % Only Heard About/Seen

63 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=19)

0 % Within past month

16 % Within past 3 months

47 % Within past 6 months

37 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: Superintendent: loose-leaf format or some type of file card format would be more usable. College Prof: defects were in what ERIC has on file (relatively little of germane research...non-recency of several citations). Instr. Resources Spec: good sample, but not enough to cover this subject...bib should have been expanded by including some non-ERIC material. College Admin: abstract bibliographies should be available on subscription basis to avoid problem of ordering periodically. Principal: used as part of comprehensive study of elementary evaluation.

NON-READERS: Superintendent: passed on to coordinator of Federal programs. Unclass: referrred to person in charge of Title I program. Supervisor: have changed job positions, no longer relevant. Researcher: this document, as well as other EM documents, needs to be greatly expanded...my own ERIC search on this and other similar topics has often revealed many more relevant documents.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Document does not cover the subject. Deals very lightly with theoretical models of assessment, not at all with differences between product and process assessment... does not touch upon techniques of institutional measurement.

- Generalized; non specific. Needs more reference to instrumentation. Well written; however technical language is watered down to meet needs of school administrators. Requires immediate update. Assessment is moving rapidly toward a system involving hard-data instrumentation.

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=19)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.37 | (2.49) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.53 | (2.78) |
| Organization | 2.11 | (2.23) |
| Format | 2.79 | (2.72) |
| Textual material | 2.47 | (2.47) |

| No. of references: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| About right | 68% | (81%) |
| Too many | 5% | ( 4%) |
| Too few | 21% | (11%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.79 | (2.77) |
| Need | 2.47 | (2.39) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.63 | (2.70) |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | 79% | (73%) |
| To identify documents on particular projects | 47% | (41%) |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | 5% | (13%) |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | 16% | (11%) |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | 63% | (55%) |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | 63% | (67%) |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes 16 (84%)

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes 84 % No 16 %

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 81)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 42% | 43% | 15% |
| Potential usefulness | 27% | 49% | 23% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N= 28)

43 % Could not readily obtain a copy
32 % Not sufficiently interested
4 % Lack of time
21 % Other

(Document 44 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | | 2 | | | 1 |
| Selection of content/material | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Choice of references | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | | 3 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Organization | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
| Organization of references | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
| Format | | 3 | | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | | 2 | | |
| Look up facts | | 1 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 1 | 1 | |
| Other: ______ | | | | |
| ______ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

2 Very great

1 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

1 It is a very useful document.

2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 45 Directory of Organizations and Personnel in Educational Administration, 2nd Edition, Stuart C. Smith (Comp.), Sept. 1969. (ED 044 829)

NCEC Unit: Educational Management Clearinghouse

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Medium

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=52)

### FAMILIARITY

27 % Previously Read/Skimmed

17 % Only Heard About/Seen

56 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING (N=14)

7 % Within past month

29 % Within past 3 months

14 % Within past 6 months

50 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: limited in completeness...consequently, use was limited.

NON-READERS: Instr. Resources Spec: latest edition on order. Researcher: well, one doesn't exactly sit down with a directory and read it.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING (N=1)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

1 Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Such a document needs almost constant up-dating. Copy difficult to read...I believe that we need such a document but "Buyer Beware."
- Nearly every noteworthy professional organization is included in this new edition. Is an excellent reference for educators. Very good document.
- Three-way approach to directory is very useful. Needs biannual revision.

(Document 45 continued)

**READER EVALUATIONS** (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

**NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N=29)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 34% | 48% | 10% |
| Potential usefulness | 34% | 38% | 21% |

**Reasons for not reading:**
(N=9)

11 % Could not readily obtain a copy
56 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
22 % Other

(Document 45 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | | | | 2 | |
| Choice of references | 2 | | | | 1 | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Interpretation | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Organization of references | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Format | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Writing | 1 | | | | 2 | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | 1 | |
| Look up facts | 1 | | 2 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | | 2 | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 1 | 2 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | | 3 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | | 2 | |
| Other: __________ | | | | |
| __________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great
1 Moderately great
_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.
1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 46 Optimum School District Size, Research Analysis Series, #1, Michael E. Hickey, December 1969. (ED 035 108)

NCEC Unit: Educational Management Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 55)

FAMILIARITY

15 % Previously Read/Skimmed
7 % Only Heard About/Seen
78 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 8)

0 % Within past month
25 % Within past 3 months
13 % Within past 6 months
63 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Prog. Spec: helped provide background for work on Governor's commission. College Admin: still find use on microfiche somewhat limiting for large-scale use, but only finanically feasible method...obtain free from RCU.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 3 months
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Clear; specific; extremely well organized.
- Could use more presentations via charts and graphs. Very useful; well written article. Writing style casual and non-academic--makes for easy reading by general practitioners not technically trained.

(Document 46 continued)

**READER EVALUATIONS** (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

**NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N=43)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 35% | 37% | 28% |
| Potential usefulness | 28% | 42% | 30% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=4)

50 % Could not readily obtain a copy

50 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

0 % Other

(Document 46 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

## QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Format | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

## UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great
1 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

3 It is a very useful document.
____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 47 Program Budgeting and the School Administrator: A Review of Dissertations and Annotated Bibliography, Philip K. Piele and David G. Bunting, Sept. 1969. (ED 035 065)

NCEC Unit: Educational Management Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 72)

FAMILIARITY

10 % Previously Read/Skimmed 19 % Only Heard About/Seen 71 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 7)

0 % Within past month

14 % Within past 6 months

57 % Within past 3 months

29 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

NON-READERS: College Admin: already know about and knowledgeable in area.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Clear and interesting introduction to topic. Omits publisher, date, number of pages [in bibliographic references]. Lucid; professional; well done.

- Neither author has contributed significant publications on the topic of program budgeting. This may not be crucial, but national visibility might be helpful. One of worst explanations of program budgeting read. First 7 pages seem aimed at audience of 10-year olds. Out-of-date; content of almost no value to researchers of PPBS.

(Document 47 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage |  |  |
| Up-to-dateness |  |  |
| Organization |  |  |
| Writing |  |  |
| Format |  |  |
| Discussion |  |  |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: |  |  |
| About right |  |  |
| Too long |  |  |
| Too short |  |  |

### UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance |  |  |
| Need |  |  |
| Comparative usefulness |  |  |
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| Obtain overview |  |  |
| Look up facts |  |  |
| Identify individuals |  |  |
| Identify relevant literature |  |  |
| Update knowledge |  |  |
| Obtain new knowledge |  |  |

### IMPACT

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision |  |  |
| Applied in my work |  |  |
| Used to give advice |  |  |
| Examined other documents |  |  |
| Consulted with author(s) or others |  |  |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) |  |  |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=51)

### Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 59% | 27% | 14% |
| Potential usefulness | 53% | 18% | 27% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=14)

36 % Could not readily obtain a copy
50 % Not sufficiently interested
7 % Lack of time
7 % Other

(Document 47 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | | | 1 | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Organization of references | | 3 | | | | |
| Format | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?
Yes 2 No 1
If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____________________ | | | | |
| ____________________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

3 Very great
____ Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.
____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 48 Status and Scope of Collective Bargaining in Public Education,
M. Chester Nolte, Sept. 1970. (ED 043 100)

NCEC Unit: Educational Management Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 30)

### FAMILIARITY

13 % Previously Read/Skimmed

20 % Only Heard About/Seen

67 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 4)

0 % Within past month

0 % Within past 3 months

0 % Within past 6 months

100 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Author highly respected. For educators in states with extended exposure, document may be rudimentary...for those with little exposure and still thinking in terms of tradition and myths, document may be good place to start.

- Too much obvious and superficial summary, too little concern with causation. Does not anlyze the state of knowledge or "explain" it.

- Excellent surveys and tables. Useful background material for professionals looking in area of negotiations, students of administration, and school administrators.

(Document 48 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=20)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 55% | 25% | 20% |
| Potential usefulness | 40% | 25% | 35% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=6)

17 % Could not readily obtain a copy
50 % Not sufficiently interested
17 % Lack of time
17 % Other

(Document 48 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | | | 1 | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Organization | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Organization of references | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Format | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 2 | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | | 1 |
| Identify relevant literature | | 2 | | 1 |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | | 2 | 1 |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Other: Gain historical perspective | 1 | | | |
| | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great

2 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 49 Educational and Social Demands on the Schools, Analysis and Bibliography Series #1, September 1970. (ED 043 110)

NCEC Unit: Educational Management Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 122)

### FAMILIARITY

5 % Previously Read/Skimmed

11 % Only Heard About/Seen

84 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 6)

17 % Within past month

0 % Within past 3 months

33 % Within past 6 months

50 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Very superficial and pedestrian. Usefulness is limited to bibliography.

- Document fine as far as it goes. Its length precludes in-depth discussion. Hits high points and stops there. As a starting point, high marks; as an analysis, has some shortcomings.

- Good selection of material but needs better organization. Basic idea excellent and necessary but writing prosaic and dull. Article appears to have been hurriedly put together. Since problem was to provide a bibliography, most efficient one would be an annotated, organized one. If this were done, less explanatory material would need to be written.

(Document 49 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=103)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 38% | 47% | 15% |
| Potential usefulness | 32% | 44% | 23% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=13)

23 % Could not readily obtain a copy

46 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

31 % Other

(Document 49 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 |
| Selection of content/material | | 2 | | | | 1 |
| Choice of references | | 2 | | | | 1 |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Accuracy | | 3 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Organization | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Organization of references | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Format | | 2 | | | | 1 |
| Writing | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

| Purpose of Use | Usefulness for Various Purposes: Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 2 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great
1 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

____ It is a very useful document.
2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 50 Alternative Organizational Forms, Analysis and Bibliography Series #2, September 1970. (ED 043 111)

NCEC Unit: Educational Management Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 57)

### FAMILIARITY

16 % Previously Read/Skimmed

14 % Only Heard About/Seen

70 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 9)

0 % Within past month

44 % Within past 6 months

22 % Within past 3 months

33 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: Researcher: most helpful of the series...wish it had been little more lengthy...still a tremendously valuable resource...update and expand.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Spotty. So much more should be said...leaves incorrect impressions.

182

(Document 50 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=40)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 52% | 38% | 10% |
| Potential usefulness | 45% | 38% | 15% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=8)

50 % Could not readily obtain a copy

25 % Not sufficiently interested

25 % Lack of time

0 % Other

(Document 50 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | | | | 1 | 2 |
| Selection of content/material | | 2 | | | | 1 |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Accuracy | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 |
| Interpretation | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | |
| Organization | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Format | | 3 | | | | |
| Writing | | 2 | | | | 1 |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | | 1 | |
| Other: ______ | | | | |
| ______ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great
2 Moderately great
___ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

1 It is a very useful document.
1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 51 Models for Rational Decision Making, Analysis and Bibliography Series #6, John S. Hall, September 1970. (ED 043 115)

NCEC Unit: Educational Management Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 41)

FAMILIARITY

12 % Previously Read/Skimmed
10 % Only Heard About/Seen
78 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 5)

0 % Within past month
40 % Within past 3 months
0 % Within past 6 months
60 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Researcher: although not related to my area of interest, found it tremendously informative. College Prof: same defects as all ERIC reviews I encounter...longtime lag between appearance of items...too much on what is already common knowledge.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 3 months
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Very little interpretation given. Treatment of each "model" quite superficial. More a good beginning point to guide someone into materials he should look at when dealing with decision-making models. Not terribly useful in understanding the topic.

- Comments about specific references superficially sketchy. Writing a bit too brief for each topic.

(Document 51 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=32)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 53% | 38% | 9% |
| Potential usefulness | 44% | 38% | 16% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=4)

25 % Could not readily obtain a copy

50 % Not sufficiently interested

25 % Lack of time

0 % Other

(Document 51 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
| Selection of content/material | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Interpretation | | | 3 | | | |
| Organization | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Writing | | 3 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?
Yes 3 No ____
If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 2 | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 1 | 2 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 1 | 2 | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great
2 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

1 It is a very useful document.
2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 52 Linking Schools and State Education Departments to Research and Development Agencies, Analysis and Bibliography Series #9, September 1970. (ED 043 118)

NCEC Unit: Educational Management Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 55)

### FAMILIARITY

11 % Previously Read/Skimmed

15 % Only Heard About/Seen

75 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING (N= 6)

17 % Within past month

17 % Within past 3 months

17 % Within past 6 months

50 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: Superintendent: contributed to conceptualization of a state education renewal plan. Researcher: broadening effect in an area with which I was not too familiar. Researcher: not many documents of this nature exist...a new area. Superintendent: have read many of author's publications, did not find it necessary to ready this one.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING (N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- What there was [in content], excellent...choice too limited.
- Superficial [in content], equal to a grad student's run through Education Index.
- Linkage between title and material presented often unclear. Too brief. More detail would be most useful.

(Document 52 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 41)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 39% | 41% | 20% |
| Potential usefulness | 27% | 39% | 34% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N= 8)

38 % Could not readily obtain a copy

38 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

13 % Other

(Document 52 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | | | | 1 | 2 |
| Selection of content/material | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| Choice of references | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 3 | | | | |
| Accuracy | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Interpretation | | | 2 | 1 | | |
| Organization | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Organization of references | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Format | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 1 No 2

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | | | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | | | |
| Update knowledge | | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | | 1 | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great
1 Moderately great
1 Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

___ It is a very useful document.
1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
2 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 53 The Humanities in Preparing Educational Administrators, Robin H. Farquhar, December 1970. (ED 044 765)

NCEC Unit: Educational Management Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Higher Education

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 31)

FAMILIARITY

26 % Previously Read/Skimmed

16 % Only Heard About/Seen

58 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 8)

0 % Within past month

13 % Within past 6 months

0 % Within past 3 months

88 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Researcher: our department is redisigning the curriculum for school administrators, and this document helped form my judgments regarding curriculum matters.

NON-READERS: Prog. Spec: procrastination.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Well researched and well presented. Is a cogent treatment on that which is essentially a side-road in educational administration. Does not appear that a study of humanities organized academically achieves the purposes outlined on p. 6 of the document...the place for humanities study is in the baccalaureate program, not in the graduate school.

- Relevancy of document makes it most important. Useful for developing awareness for greater need for humanities in educational administration but also for opportunities and limitations of program development.

(Document 53 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 18)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 39% | 44% | 17% |
| Potential usefulness | 39% | 28% | 28% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N= 5)

0 % Could not readily obtain a copy
60 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
20 % Other

(Document 53 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Writing | 2 | | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | 2 | | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | | 1 | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great

____ Moderately great

1 Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

1 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 54 Legal Aspects of Control of Student Activities by Public School Authorities (Officials), #1 in the NOLPE Monograph Series, E. Edmund Reutter, Jr., December 1970. (ED 044 829)

NCEC Unit: Educational Management Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Medium

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 37)

### FAMILIARITY

3 % Previously Read/Skimmed

8 % Only Heard About/Seen

89 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 1)

100 % Within past month

0 % Within past 3 months

0 % Within past 6 months

0 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Author nationally recognized writer in field of school law. Areas covered of vital concern to practitioner. Effectively written. A well organized and carefully written reference. Practitioner can well use this document in day-to-day decision-making activities.

(Document 54 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage |  |  |
| Up-to-dateness |  |  |
| Organization |  |  |
| Writing |  |  |
| Format |  |  |
| Discussion |  |  |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: |  |  |
| About right |  |  |
| Too long |  |  |
| Too short |  |  |

### UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance |  |  |
| Need |  |  |
| Comparative usefulness |  |  |
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| Obtain overview |  |  |
| Look up facts |  |  |
| Identify individuals |  |  |
| Identify relevant literature |  |  |
| Update knowledge |  |  |
| Obtain new knowledge |  |  |

### IMPACT

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision |  |  |
| Applied in my work |  |  |
| Used to give advice |  |  |
| Examined other documents |  |  |
| Consulted with author(s) or others |  |  |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) |  |  |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 33)

### Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 79% | 12% | 9% |
| Potential usefulness | 79% | 12% | 9% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N= 3)

33 % Could not readily obtain a copy

0 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

33 % Other

(Document 54 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization | 2 | | | | | |
| Organization of references | | | | | 2 | |
| Format | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes _2_ No ___

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | | 1 | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | | 2 | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | | |
| Other: ___ | | | | |
| ___ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

_2_ Very great
___ Moderately great
___ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

_2_ It is a very useful document.
___ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
___ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 55 Social and Technological Change: Implications for Education, Philip K. Piele (Ed.) et al., December 1970. (ED 044 833)

NCEC Unit: Educational Management Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=88)

FAMILIARITY

14 % Previously Read/Skimmed

7 % Only Heard About/Seen

80 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=12)

0 % Within past month

42 % Within past 6 months

8 % Within past 3 months

50 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Prog. Spec: a good summary. Superintendent: the Kaufman work is developed in a manner that can be used with staff for planning activities.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=

RECENCY OF READING
(N=

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

[See Documents 55A, B, C, D, and E for evaluations on each chapter.]

(Document 55 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 70)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 54% | 37% | 7% |
| Potential usefulness | 46% | 44% | 9% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N= 6)

33 % Could not readily obtain a copy

0 % Not sufficiently interested

17 % Lack of time

33 % Other

**Document No. 55A** Nature of Our Changing Society: Implications for Schools, Willis W. Harman.

NCEC Unit:

Product Type: Level of Effort Index:

Subject Cluster: Visibility Index:

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=

### FAMILIARITY

_____% Previously Read/Skimmed _____% Only Heard About/Seen _____% Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=

_____% Within past month _____% Within past 6 months

_____% Within past 3 months _____% More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N= 2)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 0)

_____ Within past month _____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months _____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Intellectual level relatively high, which immediately limits reading audience. Those who dig through will find excellent material. Weakest part of paper is the formal layout which might discourage the practitioner. Writing clear but unnecessarily pedantic. Really too bad that some of the best material such as this article may never be read by most general practitioners in the education field. Creative thinkers, such as the author, owe it to their public to phrase their thoughts in terms less abstruse.

- Author writes with clarity and develops points in an orderly manner into logical conclusions. Material well organized which facilitates reading. Utilizes an extensive vocabulary which flows through his writing to the benefit of the reader. Dr. Harman's skillful treatment of the nature of our changing society with implications for schools is recommended reading.

(Document 55A continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | | | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | | | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 1 | 1 | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 2 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 55B Teacher Militancy: Implications for the Schools, Richard C. Williams

NCEC Unit:

Product Type: Level of Effort Index:

Subject Cluster: Visibility Index:

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=

FAMILIARITY

_____% Previously Read/Skimmed _____% Only Heard About/Seen _____% Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=

_____% Within past month _____% Within past 6 months

_____% Within past 3 months _____% More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month _____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months _____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Well organized. A theoretical study which depends on interpretation. Is stimulating and clear although not strikingly original.

- Several, but not all, ideas have been mentioned by others. Especially good for poorly informed and inexperienced (in negotiations) educators.

- Excellent choice of author. Scholarly, yet easy to read. Interesting to public school administrator.

(Document 55B continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 3 | | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Writing | 3 | | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | | 3 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 3 | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: Develop theory about teacher organization | 1 | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

1 Very great

2 Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

3 It is a very useful document.

_____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 55C System Approaches to Education: Discussion and Attempted Integration, Roger A. Kaufman.

NCEC Unit:

Product Type:

Subject Cluster:

Level of Effort Index:

Visibility Index:

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=

FAMILIARITY

_____% Previously Read/Skimmed _____% Only Heard About/Seen _____% Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=

_____% Within past month

_____% Within past 3 months

_____% Within past 6 months

_____% More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Imprecise; too verbose. Extensive, perhaps too extensive for a school administrator.

(Document 55C continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | 3 | | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Organization | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

| | Usefulness for Various Purposes | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

____ Very great

3 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 55D System Approaches to Educational Planning, Marvin C. Alkin and James E. Bruno.

NCEC Unit:

Product Type:

Subject Cluster:

Level of Effort Index:

Visibility Index:

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=

FAMILIARITY

_____% Previously Read/Skimmed _____% Only Heard About/Seen _____% Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=

_____% Within past month

_____% Within past 3 months

_____% Within past 6 months

_____% More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Outstanding, well done. Suited to educational administration and research and evaluation.

- Do not agree with many distinctions drawn in this piece...tends to be a bit superficial. However, useful as overview for beginners and also, at times, is provocative.

(Document 55D continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 3 | | | | | |
| Choice of references | 3 | | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Format | | 3 | | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 3 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 2 | | |
| Other: Clarify terminology | 1 | | | |
| ____ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

3 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

3 It is a very useful document.

____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 55E Educational Management Information Systems: Progress and Prospectives, John A. Evans.

NCEC Unit:

Product Type:                Level of Effort Index:

Subject Cluster:                Visibility Index:

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=

### FAMILIARITY

_____% Previously Read/Skimmed    _____% Only Heard About/Seen    _____% Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING

(N=

_____% Within past month

_____% Within past 6 months

_____% Within past 3 months

_____% More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING

(N=1)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

__1__ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- A very fine paper that exhausts the subject so far as I am aware. Only lack is the obvious fact that education has not generally adopted these techniques sufficiently to begin to shape them to its peculiar needs.

- Needed; well done.

- Well organized and clearly written. In conclusions drawn, seems the promise to increase flexibility in education through M.I.S. technology not dealt with realistically.

(Document 55E continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 3 | | | | | |
| Choice of references | 3 | | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 3 | | | | | |
| Accuracy | 3 | | | | | |
| Interpretation | 3 | | | | | |
| Organization | 3 | | | | | |
| Organization of references | 3 | | | | | |
| Format | 3 | | | | | |
| Writing | 3 | | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?
Yes 3 No ____
If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 3 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

3 Very great
____ Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

3 It is a very useful document.
____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 56 Instructional Materials Center, Don H. Coombs, et al., Dec. 1969. (ED 034 438)

NCEC Unit: Educational Media and Technology Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 251)

FAMILIARITY

12 % Previously Read/Skimmed

16 % Only Heard About/Seen

72 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 30)

13 % Within past month

13 % Within past 3 months

30 % Within past 6 months

43 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Researcher: admire efforts to vary presentations, but size of Stanford's Series 3 documents is a nuisance. College Prof: good selection of topics and annotations. Instr. Resources Spec: it would be most helpful if new documents (not over 1 year old) were packaged separately from others. ..great while studying junior year...gives background for job selection.

NON-READERS: Supervisor: no immediate need for it. Researcher: budget limitations.. limited scope of material research data available. Instr. Resources Spec: we have more resources than those in document. Instr. Resources Spec: was requested and used by faculty. Superintendent: forwarded to IMC director. Sec. Teacher: ran out of money. Instr. Resources Spec: not budgeted for using audiovisual materials.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

1 Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Annotations clear and concise...conform closely to original documents. Logically organized and most helpful. Useful basis for bibliographic reference to students interested in this area.
- Reasonably good bibliographic reference. Usefulness comes from its coverage as a source list.

(Document 56 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N= 30)

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean | | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.47 | (2.49) | No. of references: | | |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.93 | (2.78) | About right | 83% | (81%) |
| Organization | 2.37 | (2.23) | Too many | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Format | 2.60 | (2.72) | Too few | 13% | (11%) |
| Textual material | 2.70 | (2.47) | | | |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.83 | (2.77) |
| Need | 2.33 | (2.39) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.70 | (2.70) |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | 83% | (73%) |
| To identify documents on particular projects | 47% | (41%) |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | 13% | (13%) |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | 17% | (11%) |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | 50% | (55%) |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | 80% | (67%) |

IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes 21 (70%)

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes 70 % No 30 %

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 180)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 42% | 38% | 19% |
| Potential usefulness | 31% | 37% | 30% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N= 41)

32 % Could not readily obtain a copy
39 % Not sufficiently interested
5 % Lack of time
20 % Other

(Document 56 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | | | | 2 | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | | | | 2 | |
| Choice of references | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | | | | | |
| Organization | 2 | | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Format | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 3 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 3 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Other: ____________________ | | | | |
| ____________________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great

2 Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

3 It is a very useful document.

_____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 57 Museums and Media: A Basic Reference Shelf, & Museums and Media: A Status Report, Philip C. Ritterbush & Richard Grove, Dec. 1970. (ED 044 935)

NCEC Unit: Educational Media and Technology Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 136)

FAMILIARITY

8 % Previously Read/Skimmed

13 % Only Heard About/Seen

79 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 11)

55 % Within past month

18 % Within past 6 months

18 % Within past 3 months

9 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

NON-READERS: Prog. Spec: specific need did not arise. Instr. Resources Spec: I knew document was available and could be retrieved upon need. Unclass: specific topics not exactly what I wanted. Instr. Resources Spec: sent copy to museum director in Canada--contained reference that proved valuable. Supervisor: more academic than of immediate and practical interest.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Introductory part misses mark to a great extent. Bibliography told one more than I want to know about museums.

- Content for producer of service good, for consumer of service fair to poor. Author perhaps too close to own specialty and not that of intended audience. Would be of value to media generalist...will have increased importance for general educator in the near future...to appeal to the educational practitioner a new overview would be necessary.

- Seems quite useful in giving an overview of expanding role of new media in museum education. Provides useful bibliography of annotated articles for both teachers and museum specialists.

(Document 57 continued)

**READER EVALUATIONS** (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Purpose of use: | | |
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

**NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N=108)

**Utility**

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 21% | 37% | 42% |
| Potential usefulness | 15% | 31% | 52% |

**Reasons for not reading:**
(N=17)

12 % Could not readily obtain a copy
41 % Not sufficiently interested
12 % Lack of time
29 % Other

(Document 57 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Selection of content/material | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Choice of references | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 3 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | | 3 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | | 3 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 2 | | |
| Other: ____ | | | | |
| ____ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

____ Very great

2 Moderately great

1 Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

1 It is a very useful document.

2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 58 The Interview: An Educational Research Tool, Andrew Collins, December 1970. (ED 044 931)

NCEC Unit: Educational Media and Technology Clearinghouse

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=107)

FAMILIARITY

10 % Previously Read/Skimmed 8 % Only Heard About/Seen 81 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=11)

9 % Within past month 45 % Within past 6 months

27 % Within past 3 months 18 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Researcher: difficult to use. Instr. Resources Spec: reviewed and recommended it for purchase in library collection.

NON-READERS: Researcher: budget limits...would desire a copy for our research library. Researcher: was not involved in research requiring interviews...level appears too general.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

____ Within past month ____ Within past 6 months

____ Within past 3 months ____ More than 6 months ago

1 Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Like big print for wide full-page column. Clear; logical development. Good "how to" for interviewing methods.

- Excellent practical introduction. Aim of introducing a "lay" public to basic interviewing technique demands good writing...author is excellent. For people planning their first survey, exactly what is needed. Particularly impressed with lack of too much jargon, and with translation of jargon where necessary.

(Document 58 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=87)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 34% | 47% | 18% |
| Potential usefulness | 24% | 46% | 28% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=9)

22 % Could not readily obtain a copy

33 % Not sufficiently interested

22 % Lack of time

22 % Other

(Document 58 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | | 3 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Writing | 3 | | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?
Yes 3 No ____
If yes:

| Purpose of Use | Usefulness for Various Purposes | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | | 3 | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 3 | | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

____ Very great
3 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

1 It is a very useful document.
2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 59 A Position Paper on CAI Research and Development, John H. Feldhusen & Paul Lorton, Jr., February 1970. (ED 036 204)

NCEC Unit: Educational Media and Technology Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 219)

### FAMILIARITY

14 % Previously Read/Skimmed

11 % Only Heard About/Seen

76 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 30)

13 % Within past month

30 % Within past 6 months

20 % Within past 3 months

37 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: Instr. Resources Spec: helped in aspects of dissertation...preliminary to articles, would be helpful to give brief abstract of all similar items. Researcher: a more extended bibliography might improve it.

NON-READERS: Instr. Resources Spec: lack of funds has made CAI a too distant dream. College Prof: will use now that has been brought to my attention. Instr. Resources Spec: at time, few articles interested me.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Good writing style, good balance. Slight bias. Logical sequencing.
- "Watershed" critique, prepared at critical time in the development of CAI.
- Might have included something about present work with computers (student records and class or individualized scheduling). References might have been organized around papers discussed. Some copies not straight on page...words lost beyond margin. Writing far above average for this sort of thing. In its day, should have had much wider exposure to general public and within Office of Education staff.

(Document 59 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=30)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.53 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.77 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.27 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.50 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.60 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.17 | (2.32) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 80% | (82%) |
| Too long | 3% | (4%) |
| Too short | 13% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.60 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.33 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.60 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.53 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.10 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.20 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.33 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.47 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.30 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 17% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 67% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 40% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 33% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 3% | (8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 40% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=166)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 28% | 54% | 18% |
| Potential usefulness | 20% | 48% | 31% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=23)

17 % Could not readily obtain a copy

43 % Not sufficiently interested

13 % Lack of time

26 % Other

(Document 59 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Choice of references | | 3 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization | 3 | | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Format | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 3 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 3 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Other: ____________________ | | | | |
| ____________________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

3 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

3 It is a very useful document.

____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 60 A Guide to the Literature on Interactive Use of Computers for Instruction, Karl L. Zinn & Susan McClintock, January 1970. (ED 036 202)

NCEC Unit: Educational Media and Technology Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 191)

FAMILIARITY

10 % Previously Read/Skimmed 13 % Only Heard About/Seen 76 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 20)

0 % Within past month

35 % Within past 6 months

25 % Within past 3 months

40 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Admin: concluded that author had fallen behind state of the art.

NON-READERS: Instr. Resources Spec: because of cutbacks in educational funding, boards will not incorporate CAI when they cannot supply funds for library materials... ergo, report has little value for this commission. Supervisor: recommended to Math department for computer training program.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Reporting very objective. References might have been set in categories. Writing too brief in some instances for the non-expert.
- Very good overview of computer applications to education.
- As a guide, excellent. Could have taken more time to clarify (extend) issues.

(Document 60 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N= 20)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.55 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.80 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.45 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.60 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.50 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.30 | (2.32) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 95% | (82%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 5% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.85 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.40 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.60 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.35 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.10 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.30 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.30 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.35 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.15 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 20% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 65% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 35% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 55% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 10% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 20% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 146)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 36% | 44% | 19% |
| Potential usefulness | 25% | 38% | 36% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N= 25)

28 % Could not readily obtain a copy

48 % Not sufficiently interested

8 % Lack of time

16 % Other

(Document 60 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 3 | | | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | | | | | 1 |
| Accuracy | 3 | | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 3 | | | | |
| Organization | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | 3 | | | | | |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 3 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 2 | 1 | |
| Other: Evaluation of work in these areas | | 1 | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

3 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

3 It is a very useful document.

____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

**Document No. 61** Grouping for Instruction, Exceptional Children Bibliography Series, November 1969. (ED 036 034)

NCEC Unit: Exceptional Children Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 112)

### FAMILIARITY

15 % Previously Read/Skimmed

21 % Only Heard About/Seen

63 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 17)

35 % Within past month

18 % Within past 3 months

18 % Within past 6 months

29 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: Special Educator: listings of documents very helpful...liked the use of good (fairly current) research in this report...many times the research is not current and therefore, voids the article.

NON-READERS: Counselor: microfiche reader just now available. Special Educator: information I received indicated cost was too high for needs I have.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- More concerned with "gifted" children than with "ability" grouping. Poor document. Several items not important to areas...many recent and classic documents not included.
- Descriptors could follow abstracts. The ERIC system is extremely useful.

(Document 61 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N= 17)

### QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.53 | (2.49) |
| Up-to-dateness | 3.00 | (2.78) |
| Organization | 2.18 | (2.23) |
| Format | 2.76 | (2.72) |
| Textual material | 2.53 | (2.47) |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: |  |  |
| About right | 88% | (81%) |
| Too many | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too few | 6% | (11%) |

### UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.82 | (2.77) |
| Need | 2.24 | (2.39) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.71 | (2.70) |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | 65% | (73%) |
| To identify documents on particular projects | 35% | (41%) |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | 18% | (13%) |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | 18% | (11%) |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | 35% | (55%) |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | 41% | (67%) |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes 8 (47%)

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes 41 % No 59 %

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 71)

### Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 45% | 41% | 14% |
| Potential usefulness | 37% | 27% | 37% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N= 24)

38 % Could not readily obtain a copy
29 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
29 % Other

(Document 61 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | |
| Choice of references | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Interpretation | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Organization | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | |
| Organization of references | | | | 1 | 2 | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Writing | 2 | | | | 1 | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | | | |
| Other: ______ | | | | |
| ______ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

____ Very great
3 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

2 It is a very useful document.
1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 62 Programs for the Mentally Retarded, Exceptional Children Bibliography Series, September 1969. (ED 036 029)

NCEC Unit: Exceptional Children Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=108)

FAMILIARITY

22 % Previously Read/Skimmed

11 % Only Heard About/Seen

67 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 24)

13 % Within past month

21 % Within past 3 months

25 % Within past 6 months

42 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Researcher: please get documents out closer to publication dates. Special Educator: keep up to date. Special Educator: with my extensive need for information, these have been extremely helpful...users should be informed when new ones are available...would prefer them in alphabetical order by author. Researcher: serious limitation exists where cited documents are not available on microfiche.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Too general...inappropriate material included...neglected classic publications and more recent major studies. Needs updating frequently while greater attention needs to be paid to still-useful classic publications.

- Seems to be what the computer found. Copy poorly set. Difficult to evaluate since it contains no substance. Doubt that abstracts will be used by other than a small number of people...but they should have available.

(Document 62 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=24)

### QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.71 | (2.49) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.58 | (2.78) |
| Organization | 2.25 | (2.23) |
| Format | 2.75 | (2.72) |
| Textual material | 2.75 | (2.47) |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: |  |  |
| About right | 88% | (81%) |
| Too many | 4% | ( 4%) |
| Too few | 8 | (11%) |

### UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.88 | (2.77) |
| Need | 2.54 | (2.39) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.92 | (2.70) |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| To identify documents on particular topics | 83% | (73%) |
| To identify documents on particular projects | 42% | (41%) |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | 29% | (13%) |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | 17% | (11%) |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | 58% | (55%) |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | 58% | (67%) |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes 20 (83%)

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes 79 % No 21 %

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=72)

### Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 46% | 36% | 18% |
| Potential usefulness | 36% | 29% | 33% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=12)

| % | Reason |
|---|---|
| 42 % | Could not readily obtain a copy |
| 17 % | Not sufficiently interested |
| 17 % | Lack of time |
| 17 % | Other |

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

(Document 62 continued)

## QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | | | | 3 | |
| Selection of content/material | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
| Choice of references | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | | 3 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | | | | 3 | |
| Organization | | | | | 3 | |
| Organization of references | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Format | | | | 2 | 1 | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |

## UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 2 | | |
| Look up facts | | 1 | 2 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | | 2 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | | 2 | |
| Other: Note national trends | 1 | | | |
| | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great

2 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

1 It is a very useful document.

2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 63 Teaching Exceptional Children, Vol. 2, No. 3, Spring 1970.

NCEC Unit: Exceptional Children Clearinghouse

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper
Level of Effort Index: Medium*

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups
Visibility Index: Medium*

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=130)

### FAMILIARITY

20 % Previously Read/Skimmed
17 % Only Heard About/Seen
63 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=26)

35 % Within past month
19 % Within past 6 months
35 % Within past 3 months
19 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: is an attractive journal. College Prof: recommend having ideas for methods in teacher training programs. Special Educator: is probably among the best in the field of special education...very useful for training teachers. Special Educator: ought to be made more reasonably available to students. Special Educator: I don't know of any other of the same type document...should be retained as a practical information document...very practical in my work as consultant and inservice training teacher. Reading Spec: useful in designing program for emotionally disturbed youngsters.

NON-READERS: Prog. Spec: planned to read an article but someone took magazine. Unclass: only interested in diagnostic procedures, not therapy techniques.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ Within past 3 months
1 More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- As an administrator, find this type publication exposes me to ideas and experiences that I can utilize as I work with staff. Many of teaching staff find publication useful. Authors might be encouraged to include more references.

- Authors are practitioners who are superb choices for this type of journal. Accuracy less important than liveliness and interest. A refreshing change in contrast to most professional journals in our field. A unique and needed journal for the practicing teacher and clinician.

- Document well adapted to practical needs of teachers of exceptional children.

(Document 63 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=26)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.50 | (2.43) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.92 | (2.77) |
| Organization | 2.42 | (2.33) |
| Writing | 2.69 | (2.53) |
| Format | 2.92 | (2.74) |
| Discussion | 2.35 | (2.30) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 88% | (83%) |
| Too long | 4% | (4%) |
| Too short | 8% | (8%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.81 | (2.67) |
| Need | 2.46 | (2.35) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.73 | (2.52) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.54 | (2.54) |
| Look up facts | 2.27 | (2.24) |
| Identify individuals | 2.08 | (2.12) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.35 | (2.26) |
| Update knowledge | 2.42 | (2.41) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.27 | (2.18) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 15% | (23%) |
| Applied in my work | 77% | (65%) |
| Used to give advice | 42% | (49%) |
| Examined other documents | 42% | (27%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 15% | (6%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 50% | (50%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 82)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 45% | 34% | 20% |
| Potential usefulness | 37% | 37% | 26% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N= 22)

55 % Could not readily obtain a copy

18 % Not sufficiently interested

5 % Lack of time

18 % Other

(Document 63 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | | 3 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 3 | | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Format | 3 | | | | | |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 3 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 3 | | | |
| Other: __________ | | | | |
| __________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

_____ Very great
3 Moderately great
_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

3 It is a very useful document.
_____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 64 Urban Universities and the City, Review 2, David E. Sumner, April 1970. (ED 038 556)

NCEC Unit: Higher Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Higher Education

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=49)

FAMILIARITY

2 % Previously Read/Skimmed

31 % Only Heard About/Seen

67 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

0 % Within past month

100 % Within past 6 months

0 % Within past 3 months

0 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Would be helpful to know author plus title and position. Clearly presented. Organization of bibliographic references chief asset of article, annotations quite good. Would not have seen unless reviewed it as here...distribution of government contract and grant work still a problem to a practicing professional who reads a lot.

- Content generally good. Little too much emphasis on names.

- Author not identified. Well done. Writing excellent...avoidance of jargon. Very useful, however, summary affords only a bird's-eye view. Bibliography shows most important documents (up to the time of writing).

(Document 64 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=33)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 42% | 45% | 12% |
| Potential usefulness | 33% | 45% | 18% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=15)

27 % Could not readily obtain a copy
53 % Not sufficiently interested
7 % Lack of time
13 % Other

(Document 64 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 3 | | | | |
| Organization | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Format | | 3 | | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 3 | | | |
| Update knowledge | | 3 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 3 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great
2 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

3 It is a very useful document.
____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

**Document No. 65** Compendium Series of Current Research, Programs, and Proposals, Number 2: Preparing College Teachers, Carol Shulman, August 1970. (ED 041 179)

NCEC Unit: Higher Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review
Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Higher Education
Visibility Index: Low

**GENERAL FIELD SURVEY** (N= 72)

FAMILIARITY

13 % Previously Read/Skimmed
10 % Only Heard About/Seen
78 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 9)

0 % Within past month
11 % Within past 6 months
56 % Within past 3 months
33 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Admin: Cooperative production of this work with AASCU brought it to my desk because of my affiliation with that organization...that may be an important means of getting ERIC material to people who are too busy to be thorough bibliographic scholars in their own areas of responsibility.

NON-READERS: Instr. Resources Spec: ordered for future use. College Prof: similar items covered in other journals. College Prof: didn't know it was in ERIC.

**SPECIALISTS' SURVEY** (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

____ Within past month
____ Within past 6 months
____ Within past 3 months
1 More than 6 months ago
____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Handling references alphabetically by title is awkward and slights the authors. Authors intent not clear--encyclopedic rather than critical. Too matter of fact... not enough evaluation or criticism.

- Does not include references to earlier studies and conferences on variations in graduate degrees...a contemporary document without some acknowledgement of previous considerations.

- Well done, free from jargon. Main objection is clear bias in favor of the DA (Doctor of Arts)...scant attention given to attacks against the D.A.

(Document 65 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=56)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 27% | 57% | 16% |
| Potential usefulness | 16% | 46% | 30% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=7)

0 % Could not readily obtain a copy
43 % Not sufficiently interested
14 % Lack of time
14 % Other

(Document 65 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Format | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Writing | 2 | | 1 | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 2 | | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 3 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 3 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

3 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

**Document No. 66** The Crisis of Purpose: Definition and Uses of Institutional Goals, Richard E. Peterson, October 1970. (ED 042 934)

NCEC Unit: Higher Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review
Level of Effort Index: Medium *

Subject Cluster: Higher Education
Visibility Index: Medium

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=67)

### FAMILIARITY

15 % Previously Read/Skimmed
10 % Only Heard About/Seen
75 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=10)

10 % Within past month
40 % Within past 6 months
20 % Within past 3 months
30 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: College Admin: perhaps should be followed by in-depth case studies of "successful" efforts of colleges & universities to face the issue...also, a report on evaluation of higher education programs is a must...excellent, though too brief.

NON-READERS: College Admin: filed it and forgot it. College Admin: time and crisis pressures of daily job of administration cause many sins of omission. College Admin: vital in college planning process. Unclass: have copy but have not had time or real need to read.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

____ Within past month
____ Within past 6 months
____ Within past 3 months
1 More than 6 months ago
____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Old subject about which little had previously or adequately been written. A good contribution. Concluding questions pertinent and appropriate.

- Somewhat biased, but comprehensive.

- Would have preferred a slightly different emphasis on material covered. Clear and comprehensive. ERIC/HE publications pretty lifeless...stodgey and conventional looking...difficult to read because of squeezed typography.

(Document 66 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=10)

### QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.20 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.90 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.10 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.30 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.60 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.40 | (2.32) |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: |  |  |
| About right | 60% | (82%) |
| Too long | 10% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 30% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.70 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.30 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.50 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| Obtain overview | 2.60 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.30 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.10 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.50 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.20 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.10 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 30% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 60% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 50% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 40% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 10% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 30% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=50)

### Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 54% | 34% | 12% |
| Potential usefulness | 36% | 48% | 12% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=7)

57 % Could not readily obtain a copy
14 % Not sufficiently interested
29 % Lack of time
0 % Other

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

(Document 66 continued)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | | 3 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 3 | | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | | | 1 | | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 3 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | 3 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | | | 1 |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | | | 1 |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great

2 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 67 Preventing College Dropouts: A Review, James Harvey, November 1970. (ED 043 799)

NCEC Unit: Higher Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review  Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Higher Education  Visibility Index: Medium

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 65)

### FAMILIARITY

17 % Previously Read/Skimmed  12 % Only Heard About/Seen  71 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING

(N= 11)

9 % Within past month  18 % Within past 6 months

36 % Within past 3 months  36 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

NON-READERS: Researcher: literature about college dropouts almost redundant... need better definitions and interpretations, not more documents. College Admin: can't read everything.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING

(N=2)

____ Within past month  ____ Within past 6 months

1 Within past 3 months  ____ More than 6 months ago

1 Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Do not know author, but treatment of topic only fair. Left out some important findings from certain studies. [Bibliographic references] not organized as far as I can tell. Very important topic treated in a straightfoward, if somewhat superficial way.

- Doesn't differentiate between dropout, fall-out, pushout...treats all dropping out as terminal. Does not deal with variability in types of institutions (much higher in 2-yr. institutions). Doesn't hit at the really melancholy statistics for ethnic minorities and the poor. Thus, is useful, but highly oversimplified.

- What was reported was accurate. Major deficiency is superficiality.

(Document 67 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=11)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.36 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.55 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.27 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.73 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.82 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.27 | (2.32) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 73% | (82%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 27% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.64 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.18 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.36 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.64 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.09 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.00 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.18 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.64 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.00 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 18% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 91% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 36% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 36% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 0% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 18% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 46)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 52% | 41% | 7% |
| Potential usefulness | 41% | 41% | 11% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N= 8)

13 % Could not readily obtain a copy

25 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

38 % Other

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Selection of content/material | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | | 2 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | | 3 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | | 2 | 1 | | |
| Organization | | | 2 | | | 1 |
| Organization of references | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Format | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 3 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 2 | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 2 | | |
| Other: ____ | | | | |
| ____ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great

2 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

1 It is a very useful document.

2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

**Document No. 68** Consortia in American Higher Education, Report 7, Lewis D. Patterson, November 1970. (ED 043 800)

NCEC Unit: Higher Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review Level of Effort Index: Medium*

Subject Cluster: Higher Education Visibility Index: Medium

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 96)

FAMILIARITY

13 % Previously Read/Skimmed 19 % Only Heard About/Seen 69 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 12)

17 % Within past month 25 % Within past 6 months

0 % Within past 3 months 58 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: passed on to a graduate student for possible dissertation topic. ERIC problem--provinciality of presentation...does not present systems view, and for this subject results in a serious distortion...author limits consortia to those with central offices and full-time staff, yet the majority of most effective arrangements are not in this category...useful to porvide reliable overall view of subject.

NON-READERS: Unclass: did not take time to seek out...a current awareness system needed...such as sending copies of fly sheets.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month _____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months _____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Informative as well as a good teaching document. Good overview with many useful specifics and contacts. Overall, very useful. For someone who knows little or nothing about consortia, an above average beginning document; also a good resource for an experienced consortia person.

- Excellent statement of current practice and basic administrative problems on an important facet of American higher education. Emphasis is on practical side, on nuts-and-bolts problems, rather than on questions of educational theory or educational philosophy.

- ERIC-HE publications unattractive and typography crowded. Author is most knowledgeable person in area, and this is excellent summary of his knowledge.

(Document 68 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=12)

### QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.25 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.58 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.00 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.33 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.50 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 1.92 | (2.32) |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: |  |  |
| About right | 75% | (82%) |
| Too long | 0% | (4%) |
| Too short | 25% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.67 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.33 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.25 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| Obtain overview | 2.58 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 1.92 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.00 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.33 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.17 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.00 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 0% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 58% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 33% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 8% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 0% | (8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 25% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=66)

### Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 39% | 41% | 20% |
| Potential usefulness | 32% | 38% | 27% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=18)

11 % Could not readily obtain a copy

39 % Not sufficiently interested

6 % Lack of time

22 % Other

(Document 68 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 3 | | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 3 | | | | | |
| Choice of references | 3 | | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 3 | | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 3 | | | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | | | | 1 | |
| Format | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

| | Usefulness for Various Purposes | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 3 | | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 3 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| Obtain new knowledge | 3 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: Aid in policy decision | 1 | | | |
| _____ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

3 Very great

_____ Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

3 It is a very useful document.

_____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 69 Due Process in the Student-Institutional Relationship, Thomas C. Fischer, July 1970. (ED 041 189)

NCEC Unit: Higher Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Paper
Level of Effort Index: Medium*

Subject Cluster: Higher Education
Visibility Index: High

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 74)

FAMILIARITY

8 % Previously Read/Skimmed
8 % Only Heard About/Seen
84 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=6)

17 % Within past month
17 % Within past 6 months
17 % Within past 3 months
50 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ Within past 3 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Found each section very helpful and able to be used separately. Most useful of all documents I reviewed and a very reasonable price for the contents.

- Outstanding contribution of this document is its presentation of a broad and general overview of a complex field in a manner which is eminently usable and understandable by the layman/administrator.

- Clarity of writing, a remarkable feature of this piece. Document important because it does two things well: 1) delineates issues very clearly for the layman; and 2) gives practical guidance to a wide variety of higher ed personnel.

(Document 69 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 62)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 42% | 32% | 26% |
| Potential usefulness | 34% | 34% | 27% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N= 6)

17 % Could not readily obtain a copy
0 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
83 % Other

(Document 69 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 3 | | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 3 | | | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 3 | | | | | |
| Accuracy | 3 | | | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization | 3 | | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | | | 2 | 1 | | |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 2 | | 1 |
| Update knowledge | 3 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 3 | | | |
| Other: Inservice training; manual for new deans | 1 | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

3 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

3 It is a very useful document.

____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 70 College Compensatory Programs for Disadvantaged Students, Report 3, William T. Trent, September 1970. (ED 042 932)

NCEC Unit: Higher Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Guidance Paper Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Higher Education Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=86)

FAMILIARITY

5 % Previously Read/Skimmed 14 % Only Heard About/Seen 81 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=4)

25 % Within past month 25 % Within past 6 months

0 % Within past 3 months 50 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Researcher: we need publications from the Higher Education branch of ERIC similar to the Junior College Research Reviews, monographs, and topical papers.

NON-READERS: College Admin: didn't know of its existence.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month _____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months 1 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- In general, is not useful. When first read, it angered me because it fails to point out that disadvantaged means "black" to the author...there are many subgroups of disadvantaged. Programs selected for study are interesting, but are all at selected College Board-type schools which bear only a small fraction of the burden of dealing with the disadvantaged student. Most real work in this area is being done by non-selective or "open" public institutions.

- Well organized general synthesis; general discussion well planned, effectively organized.

- Found section headings on Institutional Evaluation under each college very helpful. Report should have been distributed to all institutions using Federal funds for such a program.

(Document 70 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=70)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 46% | 37% | 17% |
| Potential usefulness | 37% | 30% | 24% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=12)

33 % Could not readily obtain a copy
17 % Not sufficiently interested
25 % Lack of time
17 % Other

(Document 70 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

## QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | | | | | 1 |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Choice of references | | | | | 3 | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | | 3 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Organization | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | | | | | 3 | |
| Format | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

## UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | | 3 | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 3 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: For self comparison | 1 | | | |
| | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

3 Very great

_____ Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 71 A Developmental Research Plan for Junior College Remedial Education; Number 3: Concept Formation, John R. Boggs, August 1969. (ED 032 072)

NCEC Unit: Junior Colleges Clearinghouse

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Higher Education Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 90)

FAMILIARITY

26 % Previously Read/Skimmed 20 % Only Heard About/Seen 54 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 23)

9 % Within past month 17 % Within past 6 months

13 % Within past 3 months 61 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: used it on a research paper in graduate school. Researcher: find extremely valuable in planning research project, well written... provocative...only wish would include other than ERIC documents. Program Spec: too prosaic in writing...work is very fine, but written at a level beyond most who might use...more scholarly than operational guide.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month _____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months 1 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- A generally strong paper. If material is developed with additional examples in various subject matter disciplines, it could be extremely useful to community college teachers.

- Approach seemed somewhat confused...could not tell if paper was to explain a statistical technique, a theory, or to encourage research. Well done for a specific subject of limited applicability in a highly relevant area. Highly thought provoking.

- Contains material that appears to be general rather than relating to remedial education. Had author compared techniques for teaching concepts across remedial and nonremedial groups as a control, would have had some results that would have increased value of article immensely.

(Document 71 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=23)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.48 | (2.43) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.78 | (2.77) |
| Organization | 2.35 | (2.33) |
| Writing | 2.39 | (2.53) |
| Format | 2.70 | (2.74) |
| Discussion | 2.30 | (2.30) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 78% | (83%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 17% | ( 8%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.39 | (2.67) |
| Need | 2.17 | (2.35) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.35 | (2.52) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.48 | (2.54) |
| Look up facts | 2.22 | (2.24) |
| Identify individuals | 2.30 | (2.12) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.30 | (2.26) |
| Update knowledge | 2.26 | (2.41) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.17 | (2.18) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 9% | (23%) |
| Applied in my work | 52% | (65%) |
| Used to give advice | 39% | (49%) |
| Examined other documents | 22% | (27%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 9% | ( 6%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 43% | (50%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=49)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 41% | 37% | 22% |
| Potential usefulness | 35% | 35% | 24% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=18)

| | |
|---|---|
| 28% | Could not readily obtain a copy |
| 28% | Not sufficiently interested |
| 22% | Lack of time |
| 17% | Other |

(Document 71 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

## QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 3 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 3 | | | | |
| Accuracy | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Interpretation | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Organization | | 3 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Format | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |

## UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | | 3 | | |
| Look up facts | | 1 | 2 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | | 3 | |
| Update knowledge | | 2 | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: Stimulate research | 1 | | | |
| Try action research | 1 | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great
1 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

____ It is a very useful document.
3 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 72 Identifying the Effective Instructor, Edward F. O'Connor, Jr. and Thomas Justiz, January 1970. (ED 035 416)

NCEC Unit: Junior Colleges Clearinghouse

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper
Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Higher Education
Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=65)

FAMILIARITY

17 % Previously Read/Skimmed
15 % Only Heard About/Seen
68 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=11)

0 % Within past month
27 % Within past 6 months
18 % Within past 3 months
55 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Prog. Spec: helped me relate my work to the particular problem of the junior college.

NON-READERS: Unclass: put reference aside and in the press of dissertation, it was lost until reminded by this excerpt.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ Within past 3 months
1 More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Has a particularly specific use but is not generally helpful...is an outline in step-by-step format of a research technique.

- Obviously a case of choice of graduate student work on the basis of individual or sponsor institution...not authority, experience, etc. in the topic area. Area of investigation warrants design of research instruments, not the mere "experiment" of application of an existing instrument used in a different environment.

(Document 72 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=44)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 66% | 20% | 11% |
| Potential usefulness | 59% | 20% | 16% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=10)

30 % Could not readily obtain a copy
30 % Not sufficiently interested
20 % Lack of time
10 % Other

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

(Document 72 continued)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Selection of content/material | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Choice of references | | | | | 2 | |
| Inclusion of current material | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| Accuracy | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| Interpretation | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| Organization | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| Organization of references | | | | | 2 | |
| Format | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Writing | | | 1 | 1 | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 1 No 1

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | | | 1 | |
| Look up facts | | | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | | | 1 | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | | 1 | |
| Update knowledge | | | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 1 | | |
| Other: Develop specific research technique | | 1 | | |

Need for Document of This Type

_____ Very great
2 Moderately great
_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

_____ It is a very useful document.
1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 73 Junior College Research Review: Faculty Recruitment, Vol. 4, No. 1, Dale Gaddy, September 1969. (ED 032 864)

NCEC Unit: Junior Colleges Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Higher Education

Visibility Index: High

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 51)

FAMILIARITY

39 % Previously Read/Skimmed

10 % Only Heard About/Seen

51 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 20)

5 % Within past month

20 % Within past 6 months

10 % Within past 3 months

65 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Admin: excellent...topics seem to be of current concern. Prog. Spec: used to prepare proposal on this particular topic...cross-references with journals upon request as a reader service could be most useful for fugitive materials. Unclass: sometimes these reviews are too short, but usually cover the subject very adequately...there might be more ways of publicizing all ERIC documents, especially past issues...they are valuable and should be used by as many as possible.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

1 Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Very timely article. Because of recent court rulings about termination of non-tenured faculty, recruitment becomes even more important, and an article reviewing literature since 1969 is needed.

- Very lucid. No longer current or up-to-date.

(Document 73 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=20)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.40 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.80 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.40 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.55 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.85 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.20 | (2.32) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 85% | (82%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 15% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.50 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.05 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.70 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.70 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.20 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 1.85 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.35 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.45 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1.90 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 0% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 40% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 50% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 25% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 15% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 60% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=26)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 46% | 31% | 23% |
| Potential usefulness | 31% | 35% | 35% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=5)

20 % Could not readily obtain a copy

60 % Not sufficiently interested

20 % Lack of time

0 % Other

(Document 73 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

## QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Choice of references | | 3 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Organization of references | 3 | | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

## UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 3 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 3 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 2 | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 2 | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 2 | | |
| Other: __________ | | | | |
| __________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great
2 Moderately great
_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.
1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 74 Junior College Research Review: College-Community Relations, Vol. 4, No. 3, Barton R. Herrscher and Thomas M. Hatfield, Nov. 1969. (ED 032 888)

NCEC Unit: Junior Colleges Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Higher Education

Visibility Index: High

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 61)

### FAMILIARITY

43 % Previously Read/Skimmed

11 % Only Heard About/Seen

46 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 26)

15 % Within past month

8 % Within past 6 months

15 % Within past 3 months

62 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: Unclass: this particular one in the series did not do as good a job... thought it could have on this broad area.

NON-READERS: College Admin: issue not pertinent to a private college. Unclass: at time, did not have budget to purchase such materials...now subscribe to series.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

2 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Limited research base. General articles don't seem to contribute that much. Pretty bland. Sorry, but it just doesn't seem to strike any chord of genuine significance.

- Very useful, there is little to compare this document with. Services of ERIC (UCLA) are not duplicated elsewhere.

- A useful overview only with associated references.

(Document 74 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=26)

### QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.35 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.73 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.19 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.58 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.77 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.12 | (2.32) |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: |  |  |
| About right | 73% | (82%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 23% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.54 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.08 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.62 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| Obtain overview | 2.65 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.15 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.04 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.42 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.31 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.08 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 8% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 73% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 31% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 31% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 4% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 42% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=28)

### Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 50% | 50% | 0% |
| Potential usefulness | 50% | 36% | 14% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=7)

29 % Could not readily obtain a copy
29 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
29 % Other

(Document 74 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 2 | | | | 1 |
| Selection of content/material | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | | 2 | | | | 1 |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | | 3 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 |
| Organization | | 3 | | | | |
| Organization of references | | 2 | | | | 1 |
| Format | | 3 | | | | |
| Writing | | 3 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 1 | 1 | |
| Other: ______ | | | | |
| ______ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great

1 Moderately great

1 Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

1 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 75 Junior College Research Review: Paying for Junior Colleges, Vol. 4, No. 8, Erick L. Lindman, April 1970. (ED 038 124)

NCEC Unit: Junior Colleges Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Higher Education Visibility Index: High

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 38)

FAMILIARITY

18 % Previously Read/Skimmed 21 % Only Heard About/Seen 61 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 7)

14 % Within past month

0 % Within past 3 months

43 % Within past 6 months

43 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Researcher: very helpful. College Admin: a superficial treatment... didn't come to grips with necessary theory of "economics of scale"...however, is fine and I look at it whenever I get a chance.

NON-READERS: Instr. Resources Spec: impossible to read all relevant periodicals in professional interest area.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

2 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Superficial treatment with little depth of analysis. Could have done more for the field if it had been more comprehensive and if effort had been made to check status of information at press time. Subject timely, content fairly obsolete, and analysis shallow.

- Although there is little research in this area, review misses some major contributions.

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=23)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 48% | 48% | 4% |
| Potential usefulness | 35% | 48% | 17% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=8)

13 % Could not readily obtain a copy

25 % Not sufficiently interested

25 % Lack of time

25 % Other

(Document 75 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Interpretation | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Organization | | 3 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 2 | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | | 3 | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 2 | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 2 | | |
| Other: ________________ | | | | |
| ________________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

3 Very great

_____ Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

1 It is a very useful document.

2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 76 Junior College Research Review: Curriculum, Vol. 4, No. 6, February 1970.

NCEC Unit: Junior Colleges Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Higher Education

Visibility Index: High

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 82)

FAMILIARITY

24 % Previously Read/Skimmed

13 % Only Heard About/Seen

62 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 20)

20 % Within past month

20 % Within past 6 months

0 % Within past 3 months

60 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: used for classroom discussion. Researcher: aided in reviewing own proposal for currency.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=3)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

3 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Would question whether research is the focus or not. I believe it should be possible to build research emphasis which could assist in the transition/transmission from research to application. These articles were not so targeted.

- The ERIC Research Review is very useful to faculty, administrators, students, and researchers.

(Document 76 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=20)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.25 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.75 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.20 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.40 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.80 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.20 | (2.32) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 75% | (82%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 25% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.75 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.15 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.45 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.45 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.10 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.15 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.40 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.40 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.05 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 5% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 75% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 30% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 20% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 10% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 40% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=51)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 71% | 27% | 2% |
| Potential usefulness | 57% | 29% | 14% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=11)

45 % Could not readily obtain a copy

36 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

9 % Other

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 3 | | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Format | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 2 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____ | | | | |
| ____ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

3 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 77 Junior College Research Review: Co-operative Work-Experience Education Programs in Junior Colleges, Vol. 5, No. 2, Marcia A. Boyer, October 1970. (ED 042 455)

NCEC Unit: Junior Colleges Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Higher Education

Visibility Index: High

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=83)

FAMILIARITY

34 % Previously Read/Skimmed

16 % Only Heard About/Seen

51 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=28)

11 % Within past month

21 % Within past 6 months

21 % Within past 3 months

46 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Vocational Educator: useful for training new coordinators. Unclass: summary and updating function is invaluable. Unclass: would like more documents in the vocational-technical area. Researcher: very helpful in uncovering relevant research for national study.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

1 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- An extremely useful document to practitioners. It condenses a great deal of material which has appeared in a wide variety of publications not easily accessible to practitioners.

- Should have contained references to industry-sponsored projects, and to projects written by employers' representatives, plant managers, etc. on value (or lack of it) of cooperative work experience education in junior colleges.

- Document provides very good summary of the cooperative work-experience story. References stated make more detailed information available. Plan to use with my advisory groups.

(Document 77 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=28)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.54 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.89 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.46 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.71 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.86 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.50 | (2.32) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 68% | (82%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 29% | (10% |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.68 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.32 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.64 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.79 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.36 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.21 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.46 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.50 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.36 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 14% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 75% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 50% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 43% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 7% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 50% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=42)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 48% | 31% | 21% |
| Potential usefulness | 36% | 40% | 24% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=13)

38 % Could not readily obtain a copy
23 % Not sufficiently interested
8 % Lack of time
23 % Other

(Document 77 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 3 | | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 3 | | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 3 | | | | |
| Organization | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Format | 3 | | | | | |
| Writing | 3 | | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 3 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | 3 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | 3 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____ | | | | |
| ____ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great
1 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

3 It is a very useful document.
____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 78 The Junior College Research Review: Occupationally Oriented Students, Vol. 5, No. 3, K. Patricia Cross, Nov. 1970. (ED 043 328)

NCEC Unit: Junior Colleges Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Higher Education

Visibility Index: High

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 99)

### FAMILIARITY

37 % Previously Read/Skimmed

11 % Only Heard About/Seen

52 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 37)

16 % Within past month

19 % Within past 6 months

16 % Within past 3 months

49 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: Prog. Spec: broadened the content of a course designed to prepare community college instructors. Researcher: type of document excellent...would like to have more of this type. Vocational Educator: a basis for review of research of literature. College Prof: made me more knowledgeable in my field. Researcher: felt it was discussion of the obvious...description of teaching techniques and curricular designs would have been more helpful.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=3)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

3 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- From psycho-sociological viewpoint, article makes a contribution. Does not come to grips with any practical issues that would be of much help in planning curricula or designing courses for occupational students in junior colleges.

- Could have been expanded into a far better, more inclusive treatment of the subject.

(Document 78 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=37)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.59 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.95 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.41 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.68 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.78 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.49 | (2.32) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 81% | (82%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 14% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.78 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.32 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.51 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.62 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.32 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.14 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.35 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.49 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.11 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 16% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 81% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 41% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 43% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 3% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 51% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=51)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 59% | 35% | 6% |
| Potential usefulness | 45% | 45% | 8% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=11)

36 % Could not readily obtain a copy
27 % Not sufficiently interested
18 % Lack of time
9 % Other

(Document 78 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Organization | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Writing | 3 | | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 2 | 1 | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 3 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 2 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

3 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 79 ACTFL: Annual Bibliography of Books and Articles on Pedagogy in Foreign Languages, Dale L. Lange, May 1970. (ED 040 625)

NCEC Unit: Languages and Linguistics Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Medium

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 82)

### FAMILIARITY

41 % Previously Read/Skimmed

16 % Only Heard About/Seen

43 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 34)

21 % Within past month

18 % Within past 3 months

29 % Within past 6 months

32 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: my students have used it regularly and found references in line with expectations. College Prof: organization and table of contents were revised in subsequent years...usefulness considerably improved...maybe other improvements could be made, but I have no recommendations. College Prof: only limitations placed upon this fine bib are those required by budget...hope it gets more staff and other resources to continue fine work started. College Prof: it needs to be slightly more comprehensive, particularly in psychology areas. Sec. Teacher: served as basis for my research and was extremely helpful...my only problem was in obtaining some of the materials (no fault of the document). Supervisor: print is a bit small to read.

NON-READERS: Instr. Resources Spec: teachers get into ruts and forget they can read on their own about pedagogy.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

2 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Comprehensive coverage; format very clear. Annual Bibliography fills a very great need...does not duplicate exactly any other bibliography and is published in a journal widely read by the very people to whom such information can be most useful.

- Fine, extremely useful document. Reproduction in my copy is far from clear (too light)

- Reproduction poor...light type, sometimes unclear. An annual bibliography on foreign language teaching is most useful...the ACTFL bibliography is most complete I know.

(Document 79 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=34)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.85 | (2.49) |
| Up-to-dateness | 3.00 | (2.78) |
| Organization | 2.41 | (2.23) |
| Format | 2.88 | (2.72) |
| Textual material | 2.50 | (2.47) |

| No. of references: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| About right | 91% | (81%) |
| Too many | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too few | 9% | (11%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.94 | (2.77) |
| Need | 2.41 | (2.39) |
| Comparative usefulness | 3.00 | (2.70) |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | 85% | (73%) |
| To identify documents on particular projects | 47% | (41%) |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | 29% | (13%) |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | 0% | (11%) |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | 56% | (55%) |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | 85% | (67%) |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes 31 (91%)

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes 88 % No 12 %

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=35)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 34% | 31% | 31% |
| Potential usefulness | 14% | 34% | 49% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=13)

23 % Could not readily obtain a copy
15 % Not sufficiently interested
8 % Lack of time
54 % Other

(Document 79 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 3 | | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 3 | | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | | | | 2 | |
| Inclusion of current material | 3 | | | | | |
| Accuracy | 3 | | | | | |
| Interpretation | | | | | 3 | |
| Organization | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Organization of references | 3 | | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Writing | | | | | 3 | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 3 | | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 3 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 3 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 3 | | | |
| Other: ________ | | | | |
| ________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

3 Very great

_____ Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

3 It is a very useful document.

_____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 80 Songs in the Foreign Language Classroom, Focus Reports on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, #12, Olivia Munoz, September 1969. (ED 034 450)

NCEC Unit: Languages and Linguistics Clearinghouse

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper    Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content    Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=50)

FAMILIARITY

22 % Previously Read/Skimmed    24 % Only Heard About/Seen    54 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=11)

9 % Within past month    18 % Within past 6 months

18 % Within past 3 months    55 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month    1 Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months    _____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- There are a few misprints, regrettable in such a document.

- A useful piece, somewhat lacking in musical sophistication especially with regard to pitch. No distinction made between singing and talking, between the 1 to 12-year-old and the past-12-year-old student. Not enough emphasis upon songs as bearers of culture.

- Especially useful for younger teachers who would like to use songs in class as an aid to teaching the foreign language.

(Document 80 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 27)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 37% | 44% | 19% |
| Potential usefulness | 26% | 41% | 30% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N= 12)

8 % Could not readily obtain a copy

58 % Not sufficiently interested

17 % Lack of time

17 % Other

(Document 80 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | | 3 | | | | |
| Choice of references | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | | 3 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | 2 | | 1 |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | | 2 | 1 |
| Update knowledge | | 2 | | 1 |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 2 | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: __________ | | | | |
| __________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great
2 Moderately great
_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

1 It is a very useful document.
2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 81 The Mechanical Potential of the Language Laboratory, Focus Reports on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, #14, Edward M. Stack, May 1970. (ED 038 072)

NCEC Unit: Languages and Linguistics Clearinghouse

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper — Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content — Visibility Index: Medium

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=71)

### FAMILIARITY

24 % Previously Read/Skimmed — 24 % Only Heard About/Seen — 52 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=17)

6 % Within past month

18 % Within past 6 months

12 % Within past 3 months

65 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: I have read Stack's work on Labs 3 times, so nothing new in article for me. Supervisor: I'm sure it was extremely practical and inspiring to others who have had success in area and/or who have never tried its use.

NON-READERS: Sec. Teacher: have no chance to change my laboratory. Sec Teacher: we no longer have language lab, unfortunately. College Prof: I had other material on subject readily available.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Author's book on this subject generally considered a basic text. A brief but comprehensive synthesis of the subject. Value of this document lies in its clear and comprehensive summary of material otherwise available only in widely scattered articles or in substantial book-length treatments.

- Author probably the best person to write this report. Document presents a concise overview of the topic and suggests important readings for the individual who wants to read further.

- I noticed only one misspelling.

(Document 81 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=17)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.53 | (2.43) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.88 | (2.77) |
| Organization | 2.59 | (2.33) |
| Writing | 2.94 | (2.53) |
| Format | 2.94 | (2.74) |
| Discussion | 2.65 | (2.30) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 82% | (83%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 6% | ( 8%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.53 | (2.67) |
| Need | 2.12 | (2.35) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.29 | (2.52) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.53 | (2.54) |
| Look up facts | 2.29 | (2.24) |
| Identify individuals | 2.12 | (2.12) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.24 | (2.26) |
| Update knowledge | 2.53 | (2.41) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.06 | (2.18) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 0% | (23%) |
| Applied in my work | 47% | (65%) |
| Used to give advice | 47% | (49%) |
| Examined other documents | 29% | (27%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 0% | ( 6%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 24% | (50%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=37)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 32% | 38% | 30% |
| Potential usefulness | 24% | 38% | 35% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N= 17)

| | |
|---|---|
| 6% | Could not readily obtain a copy |
| 29% | Not sufficiently interested |
| 35% | Lack of time |
| 18% | Other |

(Document 81 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 3 | | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 3 | | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 3 | | | | | |
| Accuracy | 3 | | | | | |
| Interpretation | 3 | | | | | |
| Organization | 3 | | | | | |
| Organization of references | 3 | | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 2 | 1 | |
| Update knowledge | | 3 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 3 | | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

____ Very great

3 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 82 Linguistics and Foreign Language Teaching, ERIC Focus Report on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, #21, Freeman Twaddle, December 1970. (ED 044 381)

NCEC Unit: Languages and Linguistics Clearinghouse

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper
Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content
Visibility Index: High

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=72)

FAMILIARITY

24 % Previously Read/Skimmed
22 % Only Heard About/Seen
54 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=17)

0 % Within past month
12 % Within past 6 months
29 % Within past 3 months
59 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: useful to use in teaching future teachers. Prog. Spec: useful to keep abreast. Unclass: helped to emphasize importance of linguistics in teaching foreign languages...need for this kind of material is urgent. Sec. Teacher: was hoping the author would treat the topics to help the classroom teachers, but it fell short of goal. College Prof: presented biased picture of relationship between linguistics and foreign language teaching. College Prof: would like to see further publications on same subject.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=3)

_____ Within past month
2 Within past 6 months
_____ Within past 3 months
1 More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- An excellent piece by an author must appropriately chosen. But refers too briefly to two areas of basic importance: 1) internalization of language and language/thought; and 2) the role of habit and cognition in FL learning, a subject greatly in need of intelligent, informed discussion.

- Author an expert in field. Very few teachers in post-NDEA era need this kind of definition of "syntax," "morphology," etc. Since I have it, I use it in a limited fashion...could get along without it. Students regard it as too simplistic for the most part.

- Only a single reference cited, but it is an excellent one and well suited to the projected audience. Format well chosen. Writing admirably clear, as one would expect from this author.

(Document 82 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=17)

### QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.41 | (2.43) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.59 | (2.77) |
| Organization | 2.24 | (2.33) |
| Writing | 2.71 | (2.53) |
| Format | 2.82 | (2.74) |
| Discussion | 2.35 | (2.30) |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: |  |  |
| About right | 76% | (83%) |
| Too long | 0% | (4%) |
| Too short | 18% | (8%) |

### UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.59 | (2.67) |
| Need | 2.12 | (2.35) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.29 | (2.52) |
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| Obtain overview | 2.47 | (2.54) |
| Look up facts | 2.12 | (2.24) |
| Identify individuals | 1.94 | (2.12) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.00 | (2.26) |
| Update knowledge | 2.24 | (2.41) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1.94 | (2.18) |

### IMPACT

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 0% | (23%) |
| Applied in my work | 47% | (65%) |
| Used to give advice | 18% | (49%) |
| Examined other documents | 18% | (27%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 0% | (6%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 29% | (50%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=39)

### Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 51% | 31% | 18% |
| Potential usefulness | 49% | 28% | 23% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=16)

56 % Could not readily obtain a copy

6 % Not sufficiently interested

13 % Lack of time

19 % Other

(Document 82 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 3 | | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | | | | 1 | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | | | | | 3 | |
| Format | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Writing | 3 | | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | | 2 | |
| Identify relevant literature | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | | 2 | 1 |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | | 1 | |
| Other: ____ | | | | |
| ____ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great
1 Moderately great
1 Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.
1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

**Document No.** 83 Directions in Foreign Language Testing, Rebecca M. Valette, 1969. (ED 034 460)

NCEC Unit: Languages and Linguistics Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 74)

### FAMILIARITY

28 % Previously Read/Skimmed

18 % Only Heard About/Seen

54 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING (N= 21)

24 % Within past month

10 % Within past 3 months

14 % Within past 6 months

52 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: Sec. Teacher: had effect on my methods of testing in classroom. Sec Teacher: at that time I was serving on committee writing a guide to teaching French in Texas...this document helped in that work as well as in my day-to-day teaching. Sec. Teacher: used as a guide in re-evaluating our testing program in grades 7-12. College Prof: wish there would be more monographs of this type. Sec. Teacher: one of the first of its type and very much needed. Supervisor: most useful in helping teachers to make use of good testing procedures. One of decade's most important books on foreign language education.

NON-READERS: College Prof: was remiss in ordering a copy. College Prof: did not realize it existed in this format.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING (N=1)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

1 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Author one of leaders in testing in FL. Reference list seems too extensive... might be wise to group references under sub-topics...excellent references are buried in over-long list. Usefulness depends upon potential audience: booklet useful to teacher trainer or grad. student; of limited use to undergraduate major or teacher in service.

- Author top national specialist in FL testing. Needs updating in 1972...already weak in 1969 on objective concerning foreign life-style and literature. Simply and lucidly presented. "Modified Table of Objectives" is real improvement on Bloom whose backward outlook (he wrote in 1956, she in '69) she repeats at excessive length.

- Author has published in field, but there are others who might have made a somewhat more significant contribution. Rather heavy use of psychologist's jargon... writing is not particularly graceful. Would like to see document revised.

(Document 83 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=21)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.81 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.95 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.52 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.57 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.95 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.71 | (2.32) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 90% | (82%) |
| Too long | 5% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 5% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.91 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.62 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.76 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.81 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.29 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.05 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.29 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.62 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.14 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 24% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 86% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 71% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 24% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 5% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 48% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=40)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 55% | 27% | 17% |
| Potential usefulness | 50% | 22% | 27% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=13)

31 % Could not readily obtain a copy

15 % Not sufficiently interested

31 % Lack of time

15 % Other

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 3 | | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | | 2 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | | 2 | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 3 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 3 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | | | 1 |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 2 | | |
| Other: ____ | | | | |
| ____ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great

2 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 84 FLES: Types of Programs, ERIC Focus Report on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, #16, Lester W. McKim, October 1970. (ED 043 268)

NCEC Unit: Languages and Linguistics Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 52)

FAMILIARITY

21 % Previously Read/Skimmed  29 % Only Heard About/Seen  50 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 11)

0 % Within past month

9 % Within past 6 months

18 % Within past 3 months

73 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: I see these Focus Reports as "How To" type articles...on this criterion, most of them fall very short.

NON-READERS: Sec. Teacher: my own field is in secondary education and I do not always write for information of this type, though I read it if readily available. Sec. Teacher: we have no FLES program in our school...will read later for general interest.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month

1 Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Author used language readily understood by teachers and laymen. Usefulness limited because of shrinking number of educators who have interest in this subject.

- Author's involvement with FLES not extensive and limited to supervision of an established sequence. Same problems have been defined again and again...no substantive recommendations to offer as to what goals can be achieved with programs of various designs. Will not serve to advance reader in breadth or depth, and will not give anything for implementation.

- Author informed, yet not a special pleader for FLES. Serves well the purpose of persuading and helping to evaluate soberly, actual and contemplated FLES sequences. Very concise.

(Document 84 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=26)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 23% | 31% | 46% |
| Potential usefulness | 27% | 15% | 58% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=15)

20 % Could not readily obtain a copy

53 % Not sufficiently interested

7 % Lack of time

20 % Other

(Document 84 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 2 | | 1 | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | | | |
| Update knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | | | |
| Other: ______________________ | | | | |
| ______________________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

1 Very great

1 Moderately great

1 Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

1 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 85 New Scheduling Patterns and the Foreign Language Teacher, ERIC Focus Report on the Teaching of Foreign Languages #18, Jermaine D. Arendt, November 1970. (ED 043 269)

NCEC Unit: Languages and Linguistics Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 55)

FAMILIARITY

36 % Previously Read/Skimmed 22 % Only Heard About/Seen 42 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 20)

10 % Within past month 20 % Within past 6 months

20 % Within past 3 months 50 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: supports ongoing investigation into individualization of foreign language education. College Prof: used for methods course. Supervisor: probably had some influence on our offering mini-courses. College Prof: would be interested in modular scheduling at our college level. Sec. Teacher: keep them coming but brief and to the point...reports are excellent aid to interested teacher. Supervisor: the Focus Reports series is outstanding...we are still in process of examining our lockstep school day...the article has been reviewed positively by administrators.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month _____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months _____ More than 6 months ago

1 Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Despite 1970 copyright, some materials seem out of date, e.g., regarding the seven-period day as an innovation. Have reservations about value of module scheduling, but many schools are trying it out and need information about what has been done.

- References extensive and well chosen. Provides copy of guidelines for implementation and identified needs for consideration. Have used document many times in methods instruction, in-service workshops, and conferences.

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=20)

### QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.50 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.85 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.40 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.85 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.90 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.45 | (2.32) |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: |  |  |
| About right | 60% | (82%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 35% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.80 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.40 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.65 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| Obtain overview | 2.75 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.25 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.15 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.25 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.45 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.10 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 25% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 55% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 65% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 30% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 15% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 25% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=23)

### Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 52% | 22% | 26% |
| Potential usefulness | 43% | 22% | 35% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=12)

17 % Could not readily obtain a copy
42 % Not sufficiently interested
8 % Lack of time
25 % Other

(Document 85 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | | | | 1 | |
| Format | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 3 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

1 Very great

2 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

**Document No. 86** ERIC Products 1969-1970, 1970. (ED 041 598)

NCEC Unit: Library and Information Sciences Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Medium

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 204)

### FAMILIARITY

20 % Previously Read/Skimmed
21 % Only Heard About/Seen
59 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING (N= 41)

29 % Within past month
12 % Within past 3 months
29 % Within past 6 months
29 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: Instr. Resources Spec: in my work in State department with ERIC and professional library, is useful in summarizing available materials for staff members... would be more useful if clearly stated that is a selected list...or is it comprehensive? Instr. Resources Spec: bibs are great if only libraries would stock the contents. Other Admin: needs broader coverage. Prog. Spec: great help in program planning...usually first step is to see what ERIC products are available...thanks. Instr. Resources Spec: excellent. Instr. Resources Spec: needs cross-indexing by subject areas as there is overlap in clearinghouse products.
NON-READERS: Instr. Resources Spec: just came to my attention. Sec. Teacher: need better distribution and availability to the classroom teacher. Instr. Resources Spec: faculty will not be bothered to drive 28 miles to center where indexes are available along with the microfiche.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING (N=0)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 3 months
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Authors included are good...absence of certain authors regrettable. Am surprised that articles from publisher periodicals, e.g., "Adult Leadership," appear here.

- Annotations succinct, informative, well phrased. Since this is an annual publication, it serves as a dependable compilation of existing material and becomes more useful as issues cumulate.

- Annotations particularly helpful. Document useful to supplement such sources as Education Index and Library Literature.

(Document 86 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=41)

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.56 | (2.49) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.83 | (2.78) |
| Organization | 2.17 | (2.23) |
| Format | 2.66 | (2.72) |
| Textual material | 2.49 | (2.47) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | 83% | (81%) |
| Too many | 7% | ( 4%) |
| Too few | 7% | (11%) |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.73 | (2.77) |
| Need | 2.37 | (2.39) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.61 | (2.70) |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | 73% | (73%) |
| To identify documents on particular projects | 24% | (41%) |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | 10% | (13%) |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | 12% | (11%) |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | 51% | (55%) |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | 61% | (67%) |

IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes 33 (80%)

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes 78 % No 22 %

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 120)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 41% | 39% | 19% |
| Potential usefulness | 25% | 41% | 32% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=43)

21 % Could not readily obtain a copy
23 % Not sufficiently interested
9 % Lack of time
35 % Other

(Document 86 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Selection of content/material | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Choice of references | | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Interpretation | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Organization | 1 | | | | 2 | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Format | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | | 2 | | | 1 | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

| Purpose of Use | Usefulness for Various Purposes: Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | | | 2 |
| Look up facts | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 3 | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 3 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

1 Very great

2 Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 87 The Economics of Information: Bibliography and Commentary on the Literature, H.A. Olsen, January 1971. (ED 044 545)

NCEC Unit: Library and Information Sciences Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 128)

### FAMILIARITY

13 % Previously Read/Skimmed

10 % Only Heard About/Seen

77 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 16)

6 % Within past month

50 % Within past 6 months

25 % Within past 3 months

19 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: incorporated information into lectures, incorporated references into course bibliography, read references personally, discussed with colleague implications of study. Researcher: synthesized a new field...will now use it as basis for own writing...needs combined index by author. College Prof: is one of ERIC's great achievements...an excellent treatment for important topic...was impossible to perform a systematic literature search, in a reasonable amount of time, before appeared...a major contribution and also a model of what a useful survey article should be like.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

_____ Within past month

1 Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

1 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Good job in ferreting out and selecting authors and citations. Hard to use as reference tool.

(Document 87 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=99)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 31% | 42% | 26% |
| Potential usefulness | 19% | 42% | 38% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=13)

15 % Could not readily obtain a copy

31 % Not sufficiently interested

31 % Lack of time

8 % Other

(Document 87 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 3 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 3 | | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 3 | | | | | |
| Accuracy | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Interpretation | | | 2 | | 1 | |
| Organization | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Organization of references | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Format | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Writing | | 1 | 2 | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | | 2 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 2 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great

1 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 88 Library Serials Control Systems: A Literature Review and Bibliography, Elizabeth Pan, December 1970. (ED 044 538)

NCEC Unit: Library and Information Sciences Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 132)

FAMILIARITY

17 % Previously Read/Skimmed

9 % Only Heard About/Seen

74 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 22)

0 % Within past month

23 % Within past 3 months

45 % Within past 6 months

32 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Instr. Resources Spec: used for my own article. College Prof: useful to faculty teaching automation of libraries.

NON-READERS: Instr. Resources Spec: other priorities. Instr. Resources Spec: ordered for library service program for future research use. Instr. Resources Spec: higher priority things to do, but will read soon.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

1 Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Greater detail and documentation of conclusions would have been useful. While discussions are sketchy, selection of important programs for discussion is good. Lack of clarity caused by failure to provide enough information. Since publication of Bosseau's 1971 Review, has considerably less value, but will continue to be useful, especially if used in conjunction with that review.

- All obvious references are here...some unclassified company technical reports missing as a class. USOE gets its money's worth with this report.

- Only weakness is the main characteristic of the literature on this subject: it can't keep up.

(Document 88 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=22)

### QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.64 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.86 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.45 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.45 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.68 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.73 | (2.32) |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: |  |  |
| About right | 86% | (82%) |
| Too long | 5% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 5% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.50 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.64 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.23 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| Obtain overview | 2.64 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.14 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.14 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.41 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.55 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.18 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 23% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 36% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 41% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 27% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 18% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 45% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 98)

### Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 33% | 38% | 29% |
| Potential usefulness | 18% | 43% | 38% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N= 12)

17 % Could not readily obtain a copy

42 % Not sufficiently interested

8 % Lack of time

33 % Other

(Document 88 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 3 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | 3 | | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Format | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Writing | | 3 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 2 | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 2 | | 1 |
| Other: Learn 1969 state-of-art | 1 | | | |
| Briefing students | 1 | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

3 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

3 It is a very useful document.

____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 89 Research on Reading: Word Lists, ERIC/CRIER Reading Review Series, Bibliography 18, Mary K. Dunn & James L. Laffey, Sept. 1969. (ED 030 778)

NCEC Unit: Reading Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 110)

### FAMILIARITY

17 % Previously Read/Skimmed
19 % Only Heard About/Seen
64 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 19)

21 % Within past month
37 % Within past 6 months
5 % Within past 3 months
37 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: build into up-dating service of some sort...add an index which classifies abstracts topically or by keywords. Prog. Spec. needs constant updating. College Prof: no index--had to look for specific material by reading from cover to cover. Principal: had no real reason to use it...read to fill in my own background and because was interested.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ Within past 3 months
1 More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Generally feel introduction in this and earlier ERIC/CRIER bibliographies to be weak. Additional categories could facilitate use of the reference (other than division by date of publication alone). Inclusion of certain topics (articles) seemingly only tangentially related to Word Lists should be gathered under subheadings.

- In general a very good compilation. However, needs 1) up-dating; 2) inclusion of some important studies that were omitted (Computational Analysis of Present Day American English by Kucera and Francis, Brown University Press, 1967); and 3) more complete descriptions of some studies cited.

(Document 89 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N= 19)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.58 | (2.49) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.79 | (2.78) |
| Organization | 2.11 | (2.23) |
| Format | 2.84 | (2.72) |
| Textual material | 2.42 | (2.47) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | 74% | (81%) |
| Too many | 5% | ( 4%) |
| Too few | 16% | (11%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.79 | (2.77) |
| Need | 2.32 | (2.39) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.74 | (2.70) |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | 79% | (73%) |
| To identify documents on particular projects | 26% | (41%) |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | 21% | (13%) |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | 5% | (11%) |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | 58% | (55%) |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | 74% | (67%) |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes 15 (79%)

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes 68 % No 32 %

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 70)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 39% | 39% | 23% |
| Potential usefulness | 21% | 43% | 36% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N= 21)

33 % Could not readily obtain a copy
24 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
33 % Other

(Document 89 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Interpretation | | | | | 2 | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| Format | | | | 2 | | |
| Writing | | 1 | 1 | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

____ Very great

2 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 90 Research on Elementary Reading: Interest and Tastes, ERIC/CRIER Reading Series, Bibliography 29, Chloe Anne Miller (Comp.), August 1970. (ED 042 593)

NCEC Unit: Reading Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 118)

FAMILIARITY

11 % Previously Read/Skimmed

22 % Only Heard About/Seen

67 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 13)

15 % Within past month

31 % Within past 6 months

0 % Within past 3 months

54 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: Index system is poor.

NON-READERS: College Prof: was not aware of service at the time.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Represents improvement over earlier compilations with addition of subject subdivisions; conciseness of information on ordering documents; author index; omission of ERIC/CRIER classification numbers; and clearer introduction.

- Material seems well done.

- Interpretation poor, but this is true of most of this type of "stuff"...too bad, interpretation would aid the field if adequately done. If a person or a faculty member were employed by a publishing company, they might find this useful in preparing in-house documents.

(Document 90 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=79)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 51% | 44% | 5% |
| Potential usefulness | 41% | 38% | 20% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=26)

31 % Could not readily obtain a copy
23 % Not sufficiently interested
4 % Lack of time
35 % Other

(Document 90 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Selection of content/material | | | 1 | | 2 | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Interpretation | | | | 1 | 2 | |
| Organization | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Format | | 3 | | | | |
| Writing | | 2 | 1 | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 1 | | 1 |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | | | 1 |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | | | 1 |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | | | 1 |
| Other: ____________________ | | | | |
| ____________________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

1 Very great

1 Moderately great

1 Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

1 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 91 Accountability and Performance Contracting, William E. Blanton, November 1970.

NCEC Unit: Reading Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 73)

FAMILIARITY

7 % Previously Read/Skimmed 26 % Only Heard About/Seen 67 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 5)

20 % Within past month

40 % Within past 6 months

20 % Within past 3 months

20 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: use annotations and subheadings.

NON-READERS: College Prof: could not find a copy. College Admin: didn't have need for more information on this topic.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

1 Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- As of date of preparation, this was adequate for articles on this topic, narrowly conceived.

- Interpretation biggest weakness. Some interpretation would have made it more helpful.

- What was criterion for accepting/rejecting item in bib.? All included "accountability," "performance contracting," or Texarkana" in title. Suggest: 1) up-date; 2) annotate briefly; 3) fill in gaps; and 4) specify relevance to particular area.

(Document 91 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

## QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Coverage |  |  | No. of references: |  |  |
| Up-to-dateness |  |  | About right |  |  |
| Organization |  |  | Too many |  |  |
| Format |  |  | Too few |  |  |
| Textual material |  |  |  |  |  |

## UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance |  |  |
| Need |  |  |
| Comparative usefulness |  |  |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics |  |  |
| To identify documents on particular projects |  |  |
| To identify documents by particular individuals |  |  |
| To identify documents from particular institutions |  |  |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature |  |  |
| To see kinds of new work being reported |  |  |

## IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=49)

Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 57% | 35% | 8% |
| Potential usefulness | 45% | 43% | 8% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N= 19)

37 % Could not readily obtain a copy
37 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
21 % Other

(Document 91 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
| Selection of content/material | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Interpretation | | | | 1 | 2 | |
| Organization | | | | | 3 | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | | | | | 3 | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?
Yes 3 No _____
If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | 1 |
| Look up facts | | 2 | | 1 |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Update knowledge | | 2 | | 1 |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 2 | | 1 |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 2 | | 1 |
| Other: ____________________ | | | | |
| ____________________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great
1 Moderately great
_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

_____ It is a very useful document.
3 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 92 Guide to Materials for Reading Instruction, Supplement 1, Wayne E. Berridge and Larry Harris, Sept. 1969. (ED 032 452)

NCEC Unit: Reading Clearinghouse

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper
Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content
Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=195)

FAMILIARITY

13 % Previously Read/Skimmed
12 % Only Heard About/Seen
75 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=25)

16 % Within past month
32 % Within past 6 months
16 % Within past 3 months
36 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: was very useful for college students. Elem. Teacher: used to place children in a variety of reading materials...quick reference for me. College Prof: a good document of this type is essential...this document was incomplete, both in number of entries and in information concerning each entry.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ Within past 3 months
1 More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- No interpretations (a definite weakness), but descriptive only. Better organized than later edition (May, 1971). Not too much to recommend it except there is little of this type of document available...good only for limited reference, but might have been more useful if done better.

- Potential of this type document great. Eventually, computer storage and retrieval should be able to alleviate its major weakness (lack of organization). Classification system needs tightening and refining so as to be generally acceptable to a broad specialist/non-specialist audience. Question way in which decisions for categories were made.

- Publication would have been more useful if organized around types of content rather than by publisher. Publication of this type becomes dated too quickly. Amount of information given too brief to be of much help.

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=25)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.40 | (2.43) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.68 | (2.77) |
| Organization | 2.36 | (2.33) |
| Writing | 2.60 | (2.53) |
| Format | 2.80 | (2.74) |
| Discussion | 1.96 | (2.30) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 92% | (83%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 8% | ( 8%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.64 | (2.67) |
| Need | 2.24 | (2.35) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.32 | (2.52) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.24 | (2.54) |
| Look up facts | 2.60 | (2.24) |
| Identify individuals | 2.08 | (2.12) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.12 | (2.26) |
| Update knowledge | 2.36 | (2.41) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.16 | (2.18) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 32% | (23%) |
| Applied in my work | 72% | (65%) |
| Used to give advice | 48% | (49%) |
| Examined other documents | 16% | (27%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 0% | ( 6%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 24% | (50%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=147)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 62% | 24% | 13% |
| Potential usefulness | 53% | 29% | 17% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=23)

43 % Could not readily obtain a copy
17 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
22 % Other

(Document 92 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Selection of content/material | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
| Choice of references | | | 1 | | 2 | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
| Interpretation | | | | | 3 | |
| Organization | | | 2 | | | 1 |
| Organization of references | | | | | 2 | 1 |
| Format | | | 2 | 1 | | |
| Writing | | | 2 | | 1 | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | | 2 | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | | 2 | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | | 2 | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 2 | | |
| Other: Limited reference only | | 1 | | |
| Up-to-date resource | | 1 | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great
1 Moderately great
1 Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

____ It is a very useful document.
2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
1
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 93 Reading: What Can Be Measured? Roger Farr, 1969. (ED 033 258)

NCEC Unit: Reading Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: High

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 177)

FAMILIARITY

23 % Previously Read/Skimmed 15 % Only Heard About/Seen 62 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 41)

27 % Within past month

29 % Within past 6 months

15 % Within past 3 months

29 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Admin: improved my knowledge of this aspect of the reading area. Reading Spec: brought together widely scattered information. Researcher: assisted with accountability of reading clinic, center, services. College Prof: It's restricted to only those publishers who sent in materials...haven't been able to locate materials in it that the last four inquiries have requested, so perhaps not being listed is significant? Reading Spec: must be updated periodically...aided staff in making choice of tests/testing procedures for students participating in reading centers in county. College Prof: lacked an index...otherwise excellent... probably the most useful in the field. College Prof: research reviews on topics of this kind are essential if changes in instruction are to take place. College Prof: obtained this document from IRA, not ERIC. NON-READERS: Other Admin: have copy in our library, will use as need arises. Researcher: just saw the reference last week.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

2 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Writer expressed himself clearly, but factual accuracy only fairly good and experimental findings and conclusions to be drawn from them only fair. However, it is probably the best overview of the topic available.

- In most cases, lays out research background and arguments nicely and proceeds logically to conclusions and recommendations. Well done for most part...first chapter wandered a bit. Very easy to follow thoughts and arguments.

(Document 93 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N= 41)

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.63 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.90 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.34 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.37 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.73 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.37 | (2.32) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 88% | (82%) |
| Too long | 10% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 2% | (10%) |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.90 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.68 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.71 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.76 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.37 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.00 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.37 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.54 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.12 | (2.14) |

IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 37% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 73% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 66% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 37% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 10% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 66% | (46% |

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=110)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 68% | 22% | 10% |
| Potential usefulness | 59% | 27% | 13% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=26)

| | |
|---|---|
| 42 % | Could not readily obtain a copy |
| 23 % | Not sufficiently interested |
| 4 % | Lack of time |
| 15 % | Other |

(Document 93 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| Organization | | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 2 | | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____________________ | | | | |
| ____________________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great

1 Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

1 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 94 **Annotated Bibliography and Descriptive Summary of Dissertations and Theses on Rurality and Small Schools**, David R. & Tanya S. Kniefel, May 1970. (ED 039 962)

NCEC Unit: Rural Education and Small Schools Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography
Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups
Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=67)

FAMILIARITY

21 % Previously Read/Skimmed
12 % Only Heard About/Seen
67 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=14)

7 % Within past month
29 % Within past 6 months
36 % Within past 3 months
29 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Prog. Spec: could have been even more useful if all studies would have included specific findings.

NON-READERS: Researcher: I already knew the findings reported.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ Within past 3 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Valuable reference. Impressive; well structured. Useful and helpful document. Must be updated from time to time.

(Document 94 continued)

**READER EVALUATIONS** (N= 14)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.36 | (2.49) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.79 | (2.78) |
| Organization | 2.14 | (2.23) |
| Format | 2.79 | (2.72) |
| Textual material | 2.50 | (2.47) |

| No. of references: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| About right | 93% | (81%) |
| Too many | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too few | 0% | (11%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.57 | (2.77) |
| Need | 2.29 | (2.39) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.50 | (2.70) |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | 79% | (73%) |
| To identify documents on particular projects | 50% | (41%) |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | 0% | (13%) |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | 0% | (11%) |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | 36% | (55%) |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | 71% | (67%) |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes 8 (57%)

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes 57 % No 43 %

**NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N= 45)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 31% | 49% | 20% |
| Potential usefulness | 22% | 47% | 31% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N= 8)

50 % Could not readily obtain a copy
25 % Not sufficiently interested
13 % Lack of time
13 % Other

(Document 94 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | | 2 | | | | |
| Choice of references | | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | | 2 | | | | |
| Format | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | | 1 | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 2 | | |
| Other: __________ | | | | |
| __________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

_____ Very great

2 Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

_____ It is a very useful document.

2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 95 American Indian Education: A Selected Bibliography, Cecilia J. Martinez & James E. Heathman, 1969. (ED 030 780)

NCEC Unit: Rural Education and Small Schools Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=47)

FAMILIARITY

13 % Previously Read/Skimmed

21 % Only Heard About/Seen

64 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=6)

17 % Within past month

0 % Within past 6 months

33 % Within past 3 months

50 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Unclass: should be updated. Prog. Spec: does not include all of the current research...tendency to report on work shops, etc., that are informative but not very useful as good data...would suggest inclusion of better quality material.

NON-READERS: Prog. Spec: had completed the bibliography when I came across this... used it to check my own list.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

2 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Indian committee should have reviewed materials for usefulness; fail to include appropriate cultural-behavioral studies. Such work should be prepared by clearinghouse or group specializing in Indian or Indian-Chicano education rather than rural-small schools group.
- Would support yearly supplements. Contains much source material. Would like to have information on authors in future documents.

(Document 95 continued)

**READER EVALUATIONS** (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ___% No ___%

**NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N=30)

**Utility**

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 57% | 33% | 10% |
| Potential usefulness | 47% | 37% | 17% |

**Reasons for not reading:**
(N=11)

9 % Could not readily obtain a copy
36 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
36 % Other

(Document 95 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Selection of content/material | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| Choice of references | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Inclusion of current material | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Interpretation | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| Organization | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Organization of references | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| Format | | 2 | | | | |
| Writing | 1 | | 1 | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | | | 1 |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | | | 1 |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 1 | | 1 |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | | 1 | |
| Other: To identify researh | 1 | | | |
| ____ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

1 Very great

1 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

1 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 96 School Gardens & Farms--Aspects of Outdoor Education, Peggy Miller, December 1970. (ED 045 249)

NCEC Unit: Rural Education and Small Schools Clearinghouse

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper

Level of Effort Index: Medium *

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=37)

FAMILIARITY

5 % Previously Read/Skimmed
22 % Only Heard About/Seen
73 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

0 % Within past month
100 % Within past 6 months
0 % Within past 3 months
0 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ Within past 3 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Represents well-structured endeavor. Author appears to have researched subject well. Above average in organization. Serves a general purpose.

- Contained almost no references--major weakness. Lacks facts, presents only an idealistic concept. Ignores realism; program lacks feasibility. See little value for such a paper unless based on more realistic concepts.

(Document 96 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=27)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 22% | 37% | 41% |
| Potential usefulness | 15% | 41% | 44% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=8)

63% Could not readily obtain a copy
13% Not sufficiently interested
0% Lack of time
13% Other

(Document 96 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Selection of content/material | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Interpretation | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Organization | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Organization of references | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Format | | 2 | | | | |
| Writing | | 2 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 1 No 1

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 1 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

____ Very great
2 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

____ It is a very useful document.
1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 97 Student Activism-An Overview, James E. Heathman, Dec. 1970.
(ED 045 250)

NCEC Unit: Rural Education and Small Schools Clearinghouse

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=47)

### FAMILIARITY

9 % Previously Read/Skimmed

13 % Only Heard About/Seen

79 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=4)

25 % Within past month

0 % Within past 3 months

0 % Within past 6 months

75 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Interesting but not totally inclusive of all student unrest throughout nation and particularly in Southwest. Informative, factual to extent that it covers subject. Would have been more inclusive in referring to other ethnic, minority groups such as Chicanos and other Spanish surnames.

- Rather limited in content and information. Not too specific and factual.

- Material 1 1/2 - 2 years old at time of publication. Question relevance of paper to Appalachian schools. Recommendations and conclusions not original. Studies on student activism must be current; material in this document is not. Not as relevant to rural schools as to urban and suburban secondary schools.

(Document 97 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=37)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 43% | 24% | 32% |
| Potential usefulness | 32% | 27% | 38% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=6)

17 % Could not readily obtain a copy
67 % Not sufficiently interested
17 % Lack of time
0 % Other

(Document 97 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Selection of content/material | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Choice of references | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | | 2 | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Interpretation | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Organization | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Organization of references | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Format | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Writing | | 1 | 2 | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 1 No 2

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

____ Very great

3 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

____ It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

2 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 98 A Synthesis of Current Research in Migrant Education, James O. Schnur, May 1970. (ED 039 049)

NCEC Unit: Rural Education and Small Schools Clearinghouse
Product Type: Review Level of Effort Index: Medium *
Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 53)

FAMILIARITY

23 % Previously Read/Skimmed 15 % Only Heard About/Seen 62 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 12)

17 % Within past month
0 % Within past 3 months
33 % Within past 6 months
50 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Researcher: pointed out need for keeping certain documents updated.
Instr. Resources Spec: has been useful to two different units and several persons.
Sec. Teacher: as a source for thesis in educational administration, it was exceptionally valuable.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

____ Within past month
____ Within past 3 months
____ Within past 6 months
____ More than 6 months ago
____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Best reference (Monterey Co. Office of Ed. Migrant Ed. Workbook) omitted--others excellent. Content/material selection from best sources available. Accurate, factual. Needs one or two pages of facts or statistics.

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=12)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.42 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.67 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.08 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.58 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.67 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.25 | (2.32) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 83% | (82%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 0% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.83 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.50 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.58 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.50 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.42 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.08 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.25 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.17 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.00 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 25% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 67% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 42% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 25% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 17% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 58% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 33)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 36% | 42% | 18% |
| Potential usefulness | 30% | 39% | 27% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N= 8)

| | |
|---|---|
| 13 % | Could not readily obtain a copy |
| 50 % | Not sufficiently interested |
| 13 % | Lack of time |
| 25 % | Other |

(Document 98 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | | | | | |
| Choice of references | | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | | | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | | | | | |
| Organization | 2 | | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Writing | 2 | | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | | 1 | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | | | |
| Other: ____ | | | | |
| ____ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great
1 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.
____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 99 Education Innovations in Rural America, Alfred P. Wilson, December 1970. (ED 045 241)

NCEC Unit: Rural Education and Small Schools Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Medium *

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: Medium

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 79)

### FAMILIARITY

15 % Previously Read/Skimmed

25 % Only Heard About/Seen

59 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 12)

8 % Within past month

0 % Within past 3 months

25 % Within past 6 months

67 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: Researcher: perhaps need a document like this with project directors of rural projects as authors of chapters--updated every other year. Vocational Educator: is a very great need to develop synthesis of research on rural education and small schools. College Prof: good basic and general summary...used as discussion starter at conference.

NON-READERS: Researcher: passed on to colleague. Researcher: was not knowledgeable in procedures to secure it. Unclass: published after we closed a related research project.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Informative and enlightening. Good job of compiling information needed. Enjoyed all aspects.
- Very well organized; subject well covered.
- Author did excellent job of pin-pointing problems and possible solutions. On-the-scene reports especially good.

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=12)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.33 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.75 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.17 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.33 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.42 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.00 | (2.32) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 67% | (82%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 17% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.58 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.33 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.67 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.50 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.00 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 1.83 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.00 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.42 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.00 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 0% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 75% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 42% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 25% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 17% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 25% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=47)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 40% | 43% | 17% |
| Potential usefulness | 32% | 47% | 21% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=20)

40 % Could not readily obtain a copy
15 % Not sufficiently interested
10 % Lack of time
30 % Other

(Document 99 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Choice of references | | 3 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | | | | | 1 |
| Interpretation | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | 3 | | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Format | | 2 | | | | |
| Writing | 3 | | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 3 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 3 | | | |
| Other: ____________________ | | | | |
| ____________________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

2 Very great

1 Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

3 It is a very useful document.

_____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 100 The Educational Disadvantage of the Indian American Student, L. Madison Coombs, July 1970. (ED 040 815)

NCEC Unit: Rural Education and Small Schools Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 48)

FAMILIARITY

17 % Previously Read/Skimmed

10 % Only Heard About/Seen

73 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 8)

25 % Within past month

13 % Within past 6 months

13 % Within past 3 months

50 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Prog. Spec: useful in getting a view of what the Bureau of Indian Affairs considered to be relevant to Indian education since the author was a long time BIA employee. Unclass: a secondary need is an attempt to interest Kansas Extension personnel in the area because the state largely ignores the disadvantaged Indians.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Useful but gaps in area of what has been going on in Indian community. Indian advisory committee would have helped author. Better published by agency focusing on Indian education. Too little critical analysis. Failed to deal with Indian originated literature. Cited only one Indian publication. Sometimes discussed research or publications pure garbage. Ignores Indian efforts, over many years, to reform Indian education.

(Document 100 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=35)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 77% | 23% | 0% |
| Potential usefulness | 60% | 31% | 9% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=5)

40 % Could not readily obtain a copy
40 % Not sufficiently interested
20 % Lack of time
0 % Other

(Document 100 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 2 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| Organization | | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | | 2 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | | 2 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | | | 1 |
| Identify relevant literature | | 2 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | | 1 | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

1 Very great

1 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

____ It is a very useful document.

2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 101 Teacher Education, Science Education Information Report, General Bibliography Series 22, July 1969. (ED 032 441)

NCEC Unit: Science and Mathematics Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Medium

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 66)

### FAMILIARITY

27 % Previously Read/Skimmed

28 % Only Heard About/Seen

44 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 18)

11 % Within past month

44 % Within past 6 months

11 % Within past 3 months

33 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: need to distinguish research publications from expository articles. Sec. Teacher: an excellent resource and its continuance is encouraged.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

____ Within past month

1 Within past 6 months

____ Within past 3 months

____ More than 6 months ago

____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Formidable format...many Title III ESEA proposal writers should, but would not bother with it.

- Bibliography series useful to science education researchers and classroom teachers if they will use it.

(Document 101 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=18)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.44 | (2.49) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.67 | (2.78) |
| Organization | 2.17 | (2.23) |
| Format | 2.56 | (2.72) |
| Textual material | 2.33 | (2.47) |

| No. of references: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| About right | 83% | (81%) |
| Too many | 6% | ( 4%) |
| Too few | 11% | (11%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.83 | (2.77) |
| Need | 2.39 | (2.39) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.72 | (2.70) |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | 72% | (19%) |
| To identify documents on particular projects | 44% | (69%) |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | 11% | (42%) |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | 11% | (32%) |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | 78% | ( 8%) |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | 44% | (46%) |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes 16 (89%)

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes 83 % No 17 %

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=29)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 48% | 28% | 24% |
| Potential usefulness | 21% | 45% | 34% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=19)

| | |
|---|---|
| 42 % | Could not readily obtain a copy |
| 21 % | Not sufficiently interested |
| 11 % | Lack of time |
| 26 % | Other |

(Document 101 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | | | | 2 | 1 |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Choice of references | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Interpretation | 1 | | | | 2 | |
| Organization | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 1 | 2 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

1 Very great

2 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 102 Science and Mathematics for Young Children: An Annotated Bibliography, Science Education Information Reports, Francis Theiss, September 1969. (ED 033 259)

NCEC Unit: Science and Mathematics Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography    Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content    Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 72)

FAMILIARITY

7 % Previously Read/Skimmed    14 % Only Heard About/Seen    79 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 5)

0 % Within past month    60 % Within past 6 months

0 % Within past 3 months    40 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

NON-READERS: College Prof: I get what I want without looking for it. Unclass: I "could" have used it. College Prof: other activities have prevented my finding time, but I still intend to use it.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month    _____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months    _____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- One of the widest selections I've seen. Small sub-divisions for science citations useful, yet confusing. Far more science articles than math.

- Descriptions brief and to the point. Perhaps some consideration could have been given to relationship between science, math, and other disciplines. Little research reported relating to environmental education, which commenced around 1967.

(Document 102 continued)

**READER EVALUATIONS** (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Purpose of use: | | |
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

**NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N=57)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 63% | 23% | 14% |
| Potential usefulness | 47% | 39% | 12% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=10)

30 % Could not readily obtain a copy
10 % Not sufficiently interested
20 % Lack of time
30 % Other

(Document 102 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Organization | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

| Purpose of Use | Usefulness for Various Purposes | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 2 | | |
| Other: Source of books for classroom or library | 1 | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

2 Very great

1 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 103 Documents on Science and Mathematics Education in RIE, Science and Math Education Information Report, Special Bibliography Series 2, Cassandra Balthaser (ed.), August 1970. (ED 045 389)

NCEC Unit: Science and Mathematics Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 84)

FAMILIARITY

17 % Previously Read/Skimmed 21 % Only Heard About/Seen 62 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 14)

7 % Within past month 29 % Within past 6 months

21 % Within past 3 months 43 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Researcher: summary annotation or classifications might be useful. Researcher: disappointed with content references...not worth listing...bibliography more selective and more help to me.

NON-READER: Sec. Teacher: information was not needed at the time. College Prof: can get what I want, so far, without reference to the document mentioned. College Prof: learned of its existence after was needed. College Prof: as I recall, the procedure for getting copies was so complicated that I assumed the required time would not be worth the result.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

1 Within past month _____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months _____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Very difficult to score using this form [questionnaire].
- Very useful to the researcher. Copy a bit hard to read.
- Topic referencing scheme would be helpful. Documents of this type, to be of utmost service, should be advertised.

(Document 103 continued)

**READER EVALUATIONS** (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean | | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | | No. of references: | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | | About right | | |
| Organization | | | Too many | | |
| Format | | | Too few | | |
| Textual material | | | | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

**NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N=52)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 33% | 50% | 17% |
| Potential usefulness | 21% | 56% | 23% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=18)

39 % Could not readily obtain a copy
22 % Not sufficiently interested
6 % Lack of time
33 % Other

(Document 103 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Choice of references | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Accuracy | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 |
| Interpretation | | | | | 3 | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Organization of references | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Format | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | | | | 2 | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | 1 | |
| Look up facts | | 3 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 3 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 3 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 3 | | |
| Other: Facilitate search for related research | 1 | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great
1 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.
1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 104 Inservice Education for Teachers of Secondary School Science, Science Education Information Reports, Science Paper 1, Patricia Blosser, September 1969. (ED 034 912)

NCEC Unit: Science and Mathematics Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 49)

FAMILIARITY

6 % Previously Read/Skimmed

18 % Only Heard About/Seen

76 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 3)

0 % Within past month

33 % Within past 3 months

67 % Within past 6 months

0 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

____ Within past month

____ Within past 3 months

____ Within past 6 months

____ More than 6 months ago

____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Very good report, most welcome addition to science education literature.
- First of the ERIC CSE occasional papers - others should be developed in each ERIC. Concluding recommendations particularly useful. Summaries excellent. Bibliography should be kept current.

(Document 104 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=37)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 51% | 32% | 16% |
| Potential usefulness | 46% | 30% | 24% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N= 9)

67 % Could not readily obtain a copy
11 % Not sufficiently interested
11 % Lack of time
11 % Other

(Document 104 continued)

## PECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| hoice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| election of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| hoice of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| nclusion of current material | 3 | | | | | |
| ccuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| nterpretation | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| rganization | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| rganization of references | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| ormat | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| riting | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |

### UTILITY

ould you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

f yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| btain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| ook up facts | 2 | 1 | | |
| dentify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| dentify individuals or institutions | 1 | 2 | | |
| pdate knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| btain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| btain practical guidance | 3 | | | |
| ther: Obtain info. on emphasis of funding agencies | 1 | | | |
| | | | | |

eed for Document of This Type

1 Very great
2 Moderately great
_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.
1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 105 Inservice Education for Teachers of Elementary School Science, Science Education Information Reports, Patricia Blosser, December 1969. (ED 036 680)

NCEC Unit: Science and Mathematics Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 32)

FAMILIARITY

13 % Previously Read/Skimmed 28 % Only Heard About/Seen 59 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 4)

0 % Within past month
25 % Within past 3 months
25 % Within past 6 months
50 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 3 months
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Content most appropriate and extremely critical [in explaining] success of science programs at elementary and other levels. Reference list quite strong. NSF-funded activities could have been expanded. Technological ramifications for entire area of inservice activities should have been spelled out in more detail. Use of charts/illustrations may have reinforced and clarified certain findings.

- Extremely useful for college personnel preparing elementary teachers.

(Document 105 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage |  |  |
| Up-to-dateness |  |  |
| Organization |  |  |
| Writing |  |  |
| Format |  |  |
| Discussion |  |  |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: |  |  |
| About right |  |  |
| Too long |  |  |
| Too short |  |  |

### UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance |  |  |
| Need |  |  |
| Comparative usefulness |  |  |
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| Obtain overview |  |  |
| Look up facts |  |  |
| Identify individuals |  |  |
| Identify relevant literature |  |  |
| Update knowledge |  |  |
| Obtain new knowledge |  |  |

### IMPACT

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision |  |  |
| Applied in my work |  |  |
| Used to give advice |  |  |
| Examined other documents |  |  |
| Consulted with author(s) or others |  |  |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) |  |  |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=19)

### Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 47% | 32% | 21% |
| Potential usefulness | 37% | 42% | 21% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=9)

56 % Could not readily obtain a copy
11 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
22 % Other

(Document 105 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

|  | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Choice of references |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Inclusion of current material |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Accuracy |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Interpretation | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| Organization | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| Organization of references | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Format |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |
| Writing | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?
Yes 3 No _____
If yes:

| Purpose of Use | Usefulness for Various Purposes |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 |  |  |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 2 |  |  |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| Other: ______________________ |  |  |  |  |
| ______________________ |  |  |  |  |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great
2 Moderately great
_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.
1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 106 A Summary of Research in Science Education for the Years 1963-64, Elementary School Level, Science Education Information Reports, John D. Cunningham and David P. Butts, January 1970. (ED 040 304)

NCEC Unit: Science and Mathematics Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review　　Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content　　Visibility Index: Medium

---

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 18)

FAMILIARITY

6 % Previously Read/Skimmed　17 % Only Heard About/Seen　78 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 1)

0 % Within past month　0 % Within past 6 months

0 % Within past 3 months　100 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Prog. Spec: article really does not review research, simply an organized summary of listings.

---

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month　_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months　_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- NARST has had several similar but more detailed abstracts across science education K-16.
- Knowledge of research design weak. Interpretations incomplete. Not a quality analysis of research literature. Good reporters, inadequate at in-depth analysis.
- Could have given recommendations for future educational research reporting procedures.

(Document 106 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=14)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 29% | 43% | 29% |
| Potential usefulness | 14% | 57% | 29% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=3)

67 % Could not readily obtain a copy

0 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

33 % Other

(Document 106 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | | 2 | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | | 3 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 3 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 3 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 2 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

1 Very great

2 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

1 It is a very useful document.

2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 107 A Summary of Research in Science Education for the Years 1965-67 Elementary School Level, Research Review Series, Richard Haney, et al., December 1969, (ED 038 554)

NCEC Unit: Science and Mathematics Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 38)

FAMILIARITY

11 % Previously Read/Skimmed
8 % Only Heard About/Seen
82 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 4)

0 % Within past month
25 % Within past 3 months
25 % Within past 6 months
50 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READER: Prog. Spec: necessary for completion of dissertation.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 3 months
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- One page of commentary excellent.

- Range of studies reviewed too broad to allow conclusions of value to future research efforts.

- More attention could have been given to national curriculum improvement projects. Illustrations of certain findings would have helped. Recommendations and conclusions weak. Important considerations (socio-economic backgrounds, reading and psychomotor difficulties) omitted.

(Document 107 continued)

**READER EVALUATIONS** (N=

**QUALITY**

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

**UTILITY**

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

**IMPACT**

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

**NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N=31)

**Utility**

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 58% | 23% | 19% |
| Potential usefulness | 35% | 42% | 23% |

**Reasons for not reading:**
(N=3)

67 % Could not readily obtain a copy
33 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
0 % Other

(Document 107 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 3 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Organization | | 3 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Format | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | | 3 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 3 | | | |
| Update knowledge | | 3 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 3 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 3 | | |
| Other: ____ | | | | |
| ____ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great

2 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 108 Programs for Improving Science Instruction in the Elementary School-Part I, ESS, Robert Rogers & Alan Voelker, January 1970. (ED 039 128)

NCEC Unit: Science and Mathematics Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review
Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content
Visibility Index: High

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 78)

### FAMILIARITY

26 % Previously Read/Skimmed
24 % Only Heard About/Seen
50 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 20)

10 % Within past month
15 % Within past 6 months
10 % Within past 3 months
65 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: Prog. Spec: used to compare with my own study on same topic...this article weak on rationale and philosophy of new programs. Principal: we are now using the SAPA program and I was interested in reading about this and related programs. Superintendent: helped reach decision on selection of science education program. Supervisor: enabled me to bring other expertise to bear on evaluation of projects considered for implementation. College Prof: intend to use in book of readings if permission is granted...such documents are needed on major curriculum projects in areas of math as well as elementary science. Supervisor: too much philosophy, too little practical information...a better comparison of the program was needed: active centers, costs, supplies, problems, etc. Prog. Spec: need to add to the ESS and SCIS reports with one on AAAS. College Prof: a unique view. Supervisor: read original in "Science and Children." NON-READERS: Prog. Spec: cost and change factors. Prog. Spec: am inundated with too much material...this had lower priority.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ Within past 3 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Reads like advertisement for a venture some educators do not think is without limitation...evaluation should have discussed limitations seen in philosophy and implementation. Would prefer at least one author with a somewhat less positive view.

- Appears crowded - lacks illustrations.

- Too many references. No illustrations. Basically a reporting of claims about program written by persons closely identified with program.

(Document 108 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N= 20)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.80 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 3.00 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.40 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.75 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.70 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.50 | (2.32) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 90% | (82%) |
| Too long | 5% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 5% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.90 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.50 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.70 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.80 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.30 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.05 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.35 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.55 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.20 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 25% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 75% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 50% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 25% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 5% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 40% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=39)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 54% | 36% | 10% |
| Potential usefulness | 41% | 44% | 15% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=19)

42 % Could not readily obtain a copy

5 % Not sufficiently interested

16 % Lack of time

21 % Other

(Document 108 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

## QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
| Selection of content/material | | 3 | | | | |
| Choice of references | | 3 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | | 3 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Organization | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Format | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Writing | | 3 | | | | |

## UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | | | |
| Update knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 2 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

1 Very great

2 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

1 It is a very useful document.

2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 109 Programs for Improving Science Instruction in the Elementary School, Part II, SCIS, Barbara S. Thomson and Alan M. Voelker. (Reprint, May 1970)

NCEC Unit: Science and Mathematics Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content Visibility Index: High

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 49)

FAMILIARITY

35 % Previously Read/Skimmed 22 % Only Heard About/Seen 43 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 17)

18 % Within past month 12 % Within past 6 months

0 % Within past 3 months 71 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Researcher: interested to see how it compared with my own work. College Prof: wish to use in book of readings for elementary teachers. Prog. Spec: one of the best in series. Supervisor: contributed to data for implementation. College Prof: to see how a colleague viewed SCIS. College Prof: several hundred reprints have been distributed by my organization...much more useful to me than bibliographic listings. Prog. Spec: need reports on other elementary sciences programs, e.g., AAAS. Supervisor: more practical information needed about implementation...motivated me on the topic.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month _____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months _____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Excellent diagrams and tables; good use of differenct types of print. Content very practical; useful to teachers and administrators.

- Some very peculiar English at times.

- Too wordy. Could have been more interestingly written and more to the point.

(Document 109 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=17)

### QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.71 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.88 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.47 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.71 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.76 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.53 | (2.32) |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: |  |  |
| About right | 88% | (84%) |
| Too long | 6% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 6% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.88 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.47 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.76 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| Obtain overview | 2.71 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.24 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.24 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.47 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.53 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.24 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 24% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 71% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 59% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 29% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 6% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 24% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 21)

### Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 67% | 14% | 19% |
| Potential usefulness | 52% | 29% | 19% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=11)

36 % Could not readily obtain a copy
9 % Not sufficiently interested
27 % Lack of time
9 % Other

(Document 109 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 3 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | | 3 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 3 | | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | | 3 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | | 1 | 2 | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____ | | | | |
| ____ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great
2 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.
1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

**Document No. 110** A Summary of Research in Science Education for the Years 1965-67, Secondary School Level, Science Education Information Reports, Paul Westmeyer, et al., September 1969.

NCEC Unit: Science and Mathematics Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review  Level of Effort Index: Medium *

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content  Visibility Index: Medium *

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 49)

FAMILIARITY

16 % Previously Read/Skimmed  10 % Only Heard About/Seen  73 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 8)

0 % Within past month  25 % Within past 6 months

25 % Within past 3 months  50 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Prog. Spec: more interpretation of the findings is needed or some critical evaluation...simply reporting findings in a sentence or two is no more than a bibliography.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month  _____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months  _____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Additional author from Research or Measurement and Statistics would have significantly improved interpretations. Material not exhaustive for time period.

- Might have been more reporting on related research outside of science field dealing with learning theory. Weak in areas of ideas to be investigated and opinions. Good for background material and sources of information for investigation.

- ERIC should continue these 2 year reviews. A period review of where we are in science education would also be helpful. Usefulness of document would be greatly increased if current research was reconciled with past work. More commentary by authors would be useful.

(Document 110 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 41)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 61% | 24% | 15% |
| Potential usefulness | 37% | 37% | 20% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=5)

80 % Could not readily obtain a copy
0 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
20 % Other

(Document 110 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Selection of content/material | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 |
| Choice of references | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
| Writing | | 2 | 1 | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | | 3 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 2 | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 2 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great

1 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 111 Off the African Shelf: An Annotated Bibliography on Society and Education, Joanne Binkley, December 1970. (ED 044 349)

NCEC Unit: Social Science Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=97)

### FAMILIARITY

4 % Previously Read/Skimmed

15 % Only Heard About/Seen

80 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING (N=4)

25 % Within past month

25 % Within past 6 months

50 % Within past 3 months

0 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

NON-READERS: College Prof: cost in relationship to interest seemed high...this is based on what it costs to obtain a Xerox copy...microfiche is too involved to use at my university. Researcher: did not have sufficient demand at time...but will be good resource.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

### RECENCY OF READING (N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- No author indicated. Poorly organized...mixes units with teacher guides, ends with disorganized miscellany, mixes Africana with Afro-American. Document useful for educators planning secondary school study of Africa, but poorly organized; omits at least two relevant sources; concluding entries disorganized...hodgepodge of useless materials. Starts out well...ends very poorly!

- Choice of references limited but good. Features high degree of objectivity in representing scope and content of items listed. Format uninteresting, tedious, somewhat monotonous. The restrictive nature of the documents and overabundance of "Project Africa"-related materials greatly limits usefulness of document.

(Document 111 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=78)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 33% | 36% | 31% |
| Potential usefulness | 21% | 37% | 40% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=15)

13 % Could not readily obtain a copy

40 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

47 % Other

(Document 111 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| Selection of content/material | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Choice of references | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Organization of references | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Format | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | | 2 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | | 1 | 1 | |
| Look up facts | 1 | | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | | 1 | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

1 Very great

1 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

1 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

**Document No.** 112 Preparing to Teach Economics: Sources and Approaches, Interpretive Series #2, Suzanne Wiggins Helburn, April 1971. (ED 049 997)

NCEC Unit: Social Science Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=74)

### FAMILIARITY

11 % Previously Read/Skimmed 14 % Only Heard About/Seen 76 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=8)

13 % Within past month

25 % Within past 3 months

50 % Within past 6 months

13 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: helpful in preparing activities for undergraduate students in social studies methods and materials course.

NON-READERS: Prog. Spec: lack of need. Prog Spec: we were reorganizing our Economics curriculum, but teachers did not want to use it, as Economics had been taught in our high schools as required courses for many years.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

____ Within past month

____ Within past 3 months

1 Within past 6 months

____ More than 6 months ago

____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Very well done; easily readable...even entertaining...very well organized. Document superb...makes a difficult and too-often dry and confusing subject quite intelligible to the non-economics teacher. An excellent ERIC/CHESS document.

- Choice of references highly representative. Ideas presented very clearly. Laid out in a very logical order; flow reasonable and smooth. Presentation of ideas graphically, as well as verbally, useful to enhance understanding. Refreshing to find bibliography divided and interspersed throughout paper...most logical to place bibliographic reference adjacent to related material. Writing style makes content more easily understandable and even enjoyable.

(Document 112 continued)

**READER EVALUATIONS** (N=

QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage |  |  |
| Up-to-dateness |  |  |
| Organization |  |  |
| Writing |  |  |
| Format |  |  |
| Discussion |  |  |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: |  |  |
| About right |  |  |
| Too long |  |  |
| Too short |  |  |

UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance |  |  |
| Need |  |  |
| Comparative usefulness |  |  |
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| Obtain overview |  |  |
| Look up facts |  |  |
| Identify individuals |  |  |
| Identify relevant literature |  |  |
| Update knowledge |  |  |
| Obtain new knowledge |  |  |

IMPACT

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision |  |  |
| Applied in my work |  |  |
| Used to give advice |  |  |
| Examined other documents |  |  |
| Consulted with author(s) or others |  |  |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) |  |  |

**NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N= 56)

Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 39% | 30% | 30% |
| Potential usefulness | 27% | 36% | 36% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N= 10)

30 % Could not readily obtain a copy
40 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
20 % Other

(Document 112 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| Choice of references | 2 | | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | | | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | | | | | |
| Organization | 2 | | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | | | | | |
| Format | 2 | | | | | |
| Writing | 2 | | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | | | |
| Other: ____________________ | | | | |
| ____________________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great

_____ Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

_____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 113 A Selected Annotated Bibliography on Differentiated Staffing, Bernard McKenna, October 1969. (ED 033 898)

NCEC Unit: Teacher Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 94)

FAMILIARITY

16 % Previously Read/Skimmed

24 % Only Heard About/Seen

60 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 15)

20 % Within past month

7 % Within past 3 months

33 % Within past 6 months

40 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: document was at least 2 years behind a rapidly growing field. College Prof: suggest these need updating at intervals. Researcher: much too limited...not thorough...biased. Update at time it is requested should be considered...possibly on areas and subjects which hold top priority, top request volume, etc. Supervisor: better suited to K-12 than Jr. college. College Prof: in 1969 (and still), Tennessee was not yet interested in the concept...as interest grows, the document will be valuable if it is not outdated.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

1 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Very useful if only seeking information from the teacher-welfare viewpoint...only two references made to students' welfare. Worth publishing.
- Presents "first generation" publication re differential staffing. Revised addition needed.
- Much has happened since 1969 with respect to differentiated staffing. Need more up-to-date version.

**READER EVALUATIONS** (N=15)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.47 | (2.49) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.60 | (2.78) |
| Organization | 2.20 | (2.23) |
| Format | 2.80 | (2.72) |
| Textual material | 2.40 | (2.47) |

| No. of references: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| About right | 80% | (81%) |
| Too many | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too few | 20% | (11%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.80 | (2.77) |
| Need | 2.27 | (2.39) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.53 | (2.70) |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | 60% | (73%) |
| To identify documents on particular projects | 47% | (41%) |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | 20% | (13%) |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | 20% | (11%) |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | 67% | (55%) |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | 80% | (67%) |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes 12 (80%)

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes 67 % No 33 %

**NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N=56)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 52% | 41% | 7% |
| Potential usefulness | 38% | 45% | 18% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=23)

13 % Could not readily obtain a copy
39 % Not sufficiently interested
17 % Lack of time
30 % Other

(Document 113 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Selection of content/material | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | | | 2 | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Organization | | | 1 | | 2 | |
| Organization of references | | 3 | | | | |
| Format | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | | 2 | 1 | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | 2 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | | |
| Other: | | | | |
| | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

3 Very great

Moderately great

Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

1 It is a very useful document.

2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

**Document No. 114** Multicultural Education: A Selected Annotated Bibliography, Moira B. Mathieson & Rita M. Tatis, September 1970. (ED 043 572)

NCEC Unit: Teacher Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 88)

### FAMILIARITY

7 % Previously Read/Skimmed

13 % Only Heard About/Seen

81 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 6)

0 % Within past month

50 % Within past 3 months

33 % Within past 6 months

17 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- A prestigious individual would have lent needed credibility to this highly sensitive topic. ERIC descriptors inadequate. A much better bibliography should be expected from ERIC.

- Descriptors should have included school desegregation which is where action is in multicultural education. Very poor in black-white materials; cf. Meyer Weinberg's bibliography with 10,000 items. Very inadequate now...inadequate even at September 1970 date. Too much of the material made up of reports on USOE seminars and institutes which were crummy to start with.

- Most annotations short, but give reader clue as to what he will find in document. However, several merely give ERIC descriptors which are not sufficient. Document was quite timely and probably in demand.

(Document 114 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=71)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 27% | 51% | 23% |
| Potential usefulness | 17% | 44% | 38% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=11)

27 % Could not readily obtain a copy
36 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
27 % Other

(Document 114 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| Selection of content/material | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
| Choice of references | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | | | | | 3 | |
| Interpretation | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Organization | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
| Organization of references | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Format | | 3 | | | | |
| Writing | | 2 | | | 1 | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | | 1 | 1 | |
| Look up facts | | | 2 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | | 1 | |
| Update knowledge | | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 1 | 1 | |
| Other: ______ | | | | |
| ______ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

3 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

1 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 115 Individual Instruction: Part I of a Bibliographic Series on Meeting Special Educational Needs, Lorraine Poliakoff, October 1970. (ED 044 381)

NCEC Unit: Teacher Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Higher Education Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=103)

FAMILIARITY

20 % Previously Read/Skimmed 17 % Only Heard About/Seen 62 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=21)

19 % Within past month
29 % Within past 6 months
24 % Within past 3 months
29 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Admin: could have more on college teaching (or teacher education). College Prof: document geared to common school teaching...interested in a document of this nature which focusses on higher education.

NON-READERS: College Prof: had no immediate need for it, only browsing at the time. College Admin: referred it to professors of teacher education working in area.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ Within past 3 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- A number of good quality references not included.
- Compiler unknown to me...no credibility attached to her competence and selections.
- Author a professional bibliographer...perhaps authority on topic would have been better choice. Listing of ERIC descriptors not a sufficient method of annotation.

(Document 115 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=21)

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.38 | (2.49) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.90 | (2.78) |
| Organization | 2.24 | (2.23) |
| Format | 2.81 | (2.72) |
| Textual material | 2.38 | (2.47) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | 100% | (81%) |
| Too many | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too few | 0% | (11%) |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.76 | (2.77) |
| Need | 2.43 | (2.39) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.76 | (2.70) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Purpose of use: | | |
| To identify documents on particular topics | 67% | (73%) |
| To identify documents on particular projects | 43% | (41%) |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | 10% | (13%) |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | 14% | (11%) |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | 38% | (55%) |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | 71% | (67%) |

IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes 16 (76%)

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes 76 % No 24 %

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=64)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 52% | 38% | 8% |
| Potential usefulness | 34% | 48% | 14% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=18)

39 % Could not readily obtain a copy
11 % Not sufficiently interested
17 % Lack of time
33 % Other

(Document 115 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Selection of content/material | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | |
| Choice of references | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | | | 1 | | 2 | |
| Interpretation | | | 2 | | 1 | |
| Organization | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | |
| Organization of references | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Format | | 3 | | | | |
| Writing | | 1 | | 2 | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | | 1 | 1 | |
| Look up facts | | | 2 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 1 | 1 | |
| Other: ______________ | | | | |
| ______________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

1 Very great

2 Moderately great

___ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

___ It is a very useful document.

2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 116 Ethnic Groups: Negroes, Spanish Speaking, American Indians, and Eskimos: Part 4 of a Bibliographic Series on Meeting Special Educational Needs, Lorraine Poliakoff, October 1970. (ED 044 384)

NCEC Unit: Teacher Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 72)

FAMILIARITY

6 % Previously Read/Skimmed
19 % Only Heard About/Seen
75 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 4)

25 % Within past month
50 % Within past 6 months
25 % Within past 3 months
0 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ Within past 3 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
1 Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Far too much repetition in bibliographic references. Now getting out-of-date; otherwise a rather good work.

- Needs to be updated every year. Very valuable to school teachers, community groups, and teacher trainees.

(Document 116 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage |  |  |
| Up-to-dateness |  |  |
| Organization |  |  |
| Format |  |  |
| Textual material |  |  |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: |  |  |
| About right |  |  |
| Too many |  |  |
| Too few |  |  |

### UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance |  |  |
| Need |  |  |
| Comparative usefulness |  |  |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics |  |  |
| To identify documents on particular projects |  |  |
| To identify documents by particular individuals |  |  |
| To identify documents from particular institutions |  |  |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature |  |  |
| To see kinds of new work being reported |  |  |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ___% No ___%

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 54)

### Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 44% | 43% | 13% |
| Potential usefulness | 30% | 39% | 31% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N= 14)

71 % Could not readily obtain a copy

7 % Not sufficiently interested

7 % Lack of time

14 % Other

(Document 116 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| Interpretation | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | | | 1 |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 117 Microteaching: History and Present Status, Dwight Allen & James Cooper, February 1970. (ED 036 471)

NCEC Unit: Teacher Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Higher Education

Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 87)

### FAMILIARITY

17 % Previously Read/Skimmed

22 % Only Heard About/Seen

61 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING

(N= 15)

0 % Within past month

7 % Within past 3 months

33 % Within past 6 months

60 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: we use it as supplemental reading in methods courses. College Prof: reinforced my exposure to microteaching after attending a workshop. College Admin: assisted in a writing project. Sec. Teacher: used in doctoral dissertation research and in classroom demonstration work for inservice education. College Prof: used its concepts and ideas to teach topic in graduate class. College Prof: documents such as this which consider recent trends in teacher education should be readily available to teacher educators...a summary sheet such as this one is useful...ERIC News serves this function also.

NON-READERS: College Admin: advised faculty to read it. College Admin: of general interest...am not directly involved.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

### RECENCY OF READING

(N=2)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

2 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Selection of someone other than authors might have been a gain for objectivity. Some very good references excluded.

- Paper very useful to person wishing a non-technical paper on the positive aspects of getting started in microteaching. Personally, I see the technical skills approach as more important than the microteaching.

## READER EVALUATIONS (N= 15)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.27 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.60 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.20 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.47 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.60 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.20 | (2.32) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 87% | (82%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 13% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.80 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.13 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.40 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.53 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 1.93 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.07 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.07 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.27 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.07 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 13% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 60% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 33% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 20% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 0% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 33% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=72)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 57% | 31% | 11% |
| Potential usefulness | 42% | 33% | 19% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=19)

42 % Could not readily obtain a copy

26 % Not sufficiently interested

5 % Lack of time

21 % Other

(Document 117 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Writing | 2 | | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | | 1 | |
| Other: __________ | | | | |
| __________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great

1 Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

_____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 118 A Reader's Guide to the Comprehensive Models for Preparing Elementary Teachers, Kaliopee Lanzillotti & Joel L. Burdin (Eds.), December 1969. (ED 034 076)

NCEC Unit: Teacher Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review
Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Higher Education
Visibility Index: Medium*

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 122)

FAMILIARITY

30 % Previously Read/Skimmed
19 % Only Heard About/Seen
51 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 37)

11 % Within past month
22 % Within past 6 months
5 % Within past 3 months
62 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Admin: affected development of elementary education program in my institution. College Prof: new course evolved. Prog. Spec: helped me identify programs and individuals developing materials for competency-based teacher education. Researcher: Joyce's model was used to guide our program development and research. Special Educator: excellent resource for teacher training programs. College Admin: helped me assist our faculty more toward implementation of performance-based elementary education programs. College Prof: used it in revising our teacher education curriculum. Principal: broadened my theoretical foundation and made clearer the content and methodology of teacher training and inservice courses. College Prof: received very wide publicity and dissemination. College Prof: more critical discussion needed. College Admin: a succinct summary would help practitioners and adopters. NON-READERS: Researcher: Availability--it was either too expensive or available only in fiche.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ Within past 3 months
1 More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Very important publication for individuals and institutions engaged in teacher education.

- Unique teacher education plans. Most of these plans are written as if they are "major break-throughs" in education, but they lack the "evaluation" to test their design.

- If trends enumerated in models and dialogues are real and nation-wide, usefulness of document will increase.

(Document 118 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=37)

### QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.62 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 3.00 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.35 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.32 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.81 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.38 | (2.32) |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: |  |  |
| About right | 78% | (82%) |
| Too long | 22% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 0% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.86 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.59 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.68 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| Obtain overview | 2.73 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.30 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.30 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.22 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.59 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.35 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 38% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 73% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 57% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 43% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 27% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 68% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=85)

### Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 45% | 41% | 13% |
| Potential usefulness | 32% | 41% | 21% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N= 23)

| | |
|---|---|
| 39 % | Could not readily obtain a copy |
| 30 % | Not sufficiently interested |
| 9 % | Lack of time |
| 13 % | Other |

(Document 118 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Organization of references | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
| Format | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | | 3 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 3 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: Reference in designing programs | 1 | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

3 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 119 Simulation in Preparing School Personnel, Donald Cruickshank & Frank Broadbent, February 1970. (ED 036 470)

NCEC Unit: Teacher Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Higher Education

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=94)

FAMILIARITY

9 % Previously Read/Skimmed

20 % Only Heard About/Seen

71 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=8)

0 % Within past month

25 % Within past 6 months

0 % Within past 3 months

75 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Organization very clear. Outlines at beginning helpful, since interior goes into much detail for the casual reader.

- Topics selected excellent...treatment of topics poor. Reads like a first draft. Disturbing that co-authors are also authors of two commercially available simulation kits, and considerable space is given to authors' royalty-giving material.

(Document 119 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=86)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 53% | 34% | 12% |
| Potential usefulness | 40% | 30% | 20% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=19)

37 % Could not readily obtain a copy
21 % Not sufficiently interested
11 % Lack of time
32 % Other

(Document 119 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

## QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 3 | | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | | | 1 | | |
| Organization | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |

## UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 2 | | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Other: ________ | | | | |
| ________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great
1 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.
1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 120 Preparing School Personnel for Differentiated Staffing Patterns: A Guide to Selected Documents in the ERIC Collection, 1966-1968, Marlene Ross, May 1969. (ED 028 155)

NCEC Unit: Teacher Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=99)

### FAMILIARITY

8 % Previously Read/Skimmed

14 % Only Heard About/Seen

78 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING (N=8)

13 % Within past month

25 % Within past 3 months

0 % Within past 6 months

63 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING (N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Much of work quoted related to innovation or use of persons other than regular classroom teachers, but not differentiated staffing as an organizational pattern. Clear, but not thoughtfully defensible according to my understanding of whole topic of differentiated staffing. Don't know of a similar document. Would definitely recommend publishing it with a different title.

- A hodge-podge of different articles all dealing with professional or paraprofessional roles in school, but not really as parts of differentiated staffs in the larger sense. The topic differentiated staffing is misleading for this compendium of articles.

- Oriented to higher education perception of differentiated staffing. Document represents collection of specific changes which have put education on a higher plateau but have not necessarily maintained a responsiveness to needs of those being served (students).

(Document 120 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 91)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 41% | 40% | 19% |
| Potential usefulness | 24% | 41% | 26% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N= 14)

29 % Could not readily obtain a copy

43 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

14 % Other

(Document 120 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Selection of content/material | | | 3 | | | |
| Choice of references | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| Accuracy | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Interpretation | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Organization | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Organization of references | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Format | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | | 2 | 1 | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | | 2 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | 2 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 2 | | |
| Other: ____________________ | | | | |
| ____________________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

1 Very great

1 Moderately great

1 Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

1 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 121 Classroom Observation Systems in Preparing School Personnel,
J. T. Sandefur and A. A. Bressler, March 1970. (ED 037 377)

NCEC Unit: Teacher Education Clearinghouse
Product Type: Review Level of Effort Index: Low
Subject Cluster: Higher Education Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 95 )

### FAMILIARITY

8 % Previously Read/Skimmed 16 % Only Heard About/Seen 76 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 8 )

0 % Within past month
25 % Within past 3 months
25 % Within past 6 months
50 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 3 months
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Appeared to survey much of what Simon and Boyer (editors of Mirrors for Behavior) spell out in detail.

- Quality of work fair to poor. Category schedules selected were good...examples for teaching training poor and limited. Latest reference was 1967...publication date was 1970. If option were available, paper should have been sent back for revision, or assigned to someone else.

(Document 121 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage |  |  |
| Up-to-dateness |  |  |
| Organization |  |  |
| Writing |  |  |
| Format |  |  |
| Discussion |  |  |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: |  |  |
| About right |  |  |
| Too long |  |  |
| Too short |  |  |

UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance |  |  |
| Need |  |  |
| Comparative usefulness |  |  |
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| Obtain overview |  |  |
| Look up facts |  |  |
| Identify individuals |  |  |
| Identify relevant literature |  |  |
| Update knowledge |  |  |
| Obtain new knowledge |  |  |

IMPACT

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision |  |  |
| Applied in my work |  |  |
| Used to give advice |  |  |
| Examined other documents |  |  |
| Consulted with author(s) or others |  |  |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) |  |  |

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 87)

Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 56% | 32% | 9% |
| Potential usefulness | 47% | 34% | 11% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N= 15)

| | |
|---|---|
| 47 % | Could not readily obtain a copy |
| 13 % | Not sufficiently interested |
| 7 % | Lack of time |
| 27 % | Other |

(Document 121 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | | | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | | | 1 | | |
| Interpretation | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Organization | | 3 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Format | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | |
| Writing | | 3 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 2 | | |
| Other: ______ | | | | |
| ______ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

____ Very great

3 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

____ It is a very useful document.

2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 122 Basic Annotated Bibliography on Censorship, Lee A. Burress, Jr., January 1970.

NCEC Unit: Teaching of English Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Medium*

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 58)

FAMILIARITY

5 % Previously Read/Skimmed

19 % Only Heard About/Seen

76 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 3)

33 % Within past month

0 % Within past 3 months

33 % Within past 6 months

33 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Prog. Spec: constant updating is necessary...distributed it to people who were concerned with problem. College Admin: need separate categories by levels--elementary, secondary, college.

NON-READERS: Superintendent: problem was underway to solution when articles arrived. Instr. Resources Spec: no need to use as I have comparable information on file.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

1 More than 6 months ago

1 Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Author hasn't really kept up in the field. Organization of references too simple. Tacky format. So many bibliographies on censorship that to justify this item it must be kept ruthlessly up-to-date.
- May be a need to cite items from the ultra-conservative side, for there are needed ideas from that side which teachers should be aware of.
- Very useful, especially if one is suddenly faced with a censor! Note spelling error on page 2 under the Alec Craig entry.

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 44)

**Utility**

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 30% | 43% | 27% |
| Potential usefulness | 16% | 43% | 39% |

**Reasons for not reading:**
(N= 11)

36 % Could not readily obtain a copy
27 % Not sufficiently interested
18 % Lack of time
18 % Other

(Document 122 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Interpretation | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Organization | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Organization of references | 1 | | | 1 | | |
| Format | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | | 1 | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 1 No 1

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | | | |
| Other: ______ | | | | |
| ______ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

____ Very great

1 Moderately great

1 Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

1 It is a very useful document.

____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 123 A Guide to Available Project English Materials (Revised Edition),
Donna Butler and Bernard O'Donnell, September 1969. (ED 034 775)

NCEC Unit: Teaching of English Clearinghouse
Product Type: Bibliography
Level of Effort Index: Low
Subject Cluster: Instructional Content
Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=40)

### FAMILIARITY

17 % Previously Read/Skimmed
20 % Only heard About/Seen
63 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=7)

0 % Within past month
29 % Within past 6 months
29 % Within past 3 months
43 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: haven't used since I left the university 3 years ago... searching out literature of this type takes more time--locating on microfiche or hardcover--can be disappointing in content.

NON-READERS: Supervisor: lost in shuffle. Principal: position now makes document more relevant.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

____ Within past month
____ Within past 6 months
1 Within past 3 months
____ More than 6 months ago
____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- A historical document of first importance.
- A good job; not cluttered by jargon. Serves a good purpose.
- Recommend to my students, to school English departments, and others. Document is indispensable to anyone concerned with curriculum in English.

(Document 123 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean | | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | | No. of references: | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | | About right | | |
| Organization | | | Too many | | |
| Format | | | Too few | | |
| Textual material | | | | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=25)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 36% | 56% | 8% |
| Potential usefulness | 28% | 52% | 20% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=8)

25 % Could not readily obtain a copy

13 % Not sufficiently interested

25 % Lack of time

38 % Other

(Document 123 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | | | | 1 | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Choice of references | 1 | | | | 2 | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | | | | 2 | |
| Accuracy | 2 | | | | 1 | |
| Interpretation | 1 | | | | 2 | |
| Organization | 2 | | | | 1 | |
| Organization of references | 1 | | | | 2 | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 3 | | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | | | 1 |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 3 | | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | | | 1 |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: To introduce new research area | 1 | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

3 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 124 An NCTE/ERIC Report on the Evaluation of Head Start Programs, Robert V. Denby, December 1969. (Reprint)

NCEC Unit: Teaching of English Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: High

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=40)

### FAMILIARITY

17 % Previously Read/Skimmed

27 % Only Heard About/Seen

55 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=7)

14 % Within past month

0 % Within past 6 months

14 % Within past 3 months

71 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

NON-READERS: Principal: was interested, will use in near future.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

____ Within past month

____ Within past 6 months

____ Within past 3 months

____ More than 6 months ago

____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Reading this document has made me feel guilty for not having read it earlier...it is something I should be familiar with. I'll follow the column and try to learn more about the headstart research.

- Introduction of comparatively new names as author is good...gives a fresh, invigorating slant to the collection. Writing clear, brief, and succinct...no ambiguities. Excellent in that document, in addition to presenting results of various studies, also indicates areas needed for further study and limitations of studies.

- This kind of bibliography is quickly made obsolete by newer research. However, is still useful.

(Document 124 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Purpose of use: | | |
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 22)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 32% | 50% | 18% |
| Potential usefulness | 27% | 50% | 23% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=11)

36 % Could not readily obtain a copy
18 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
18 % Other

(Document 124 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | | | | 1 | |
| Inclusion of current material | 3 | | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | | | | 1 | |
| Interpretation | | 3 | | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | | | | 1 | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 3 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: To introduce new research | 1 | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

3 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

3 It is a very useful document.

____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 125 A Reference Shelf on Curriculum Planning for the Language Arts K-8, NCTE/ERIC Report, Robert V. Denby, March 1970. (Reprint)

NCEC Unit: Teaching of English Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography
Level of Effort Index: Low
Subject Cluster: Instructional Content
Visibility Index: High

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 37)

FAMILIARITY

8 % Previously Read/Skimmed
19 % Only Heard About/Seen
73 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 3)

0 % Within past month
67 % Within past 6 months
0 % Within past 3 months
33 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Reading Spec: need references or abstracts on research, curriculum planning, etc. in Appalachia.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ Within past 3 months
1 More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Subject area is important. Makes a contribution, but would be a mistake to limit one's research to the references listed, as the title and final paragraph might suggest...reference list not comprehensive.

- The NCTE/ERIC reports have consistently informed the profession of trends, practices, research findings, etc. This article for elementary professionals is a good example.

- Attempt to maintain continuity through use of transition or introductory paragraphs lacks effectiveness. Tone of much of this material too varied...sometimes objective/scholarly, sometimes almost folksy.

(Document 125 continued)

**READER EVALUATIONS** (N=

### QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage |  |  |
| Up-to-dateness |  |  |
| Organization |  |  |
| Format |  |  |
| Textual material |  |  |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: |  |  |
| About right |  |  |
| Too many |  |  |
| Too few |  |  |

### UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance |  |  |
| Need |  |  |
| Comparative usefulness |  |  |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| To identify documents on particular topics |  |  |
| To identify documents on particular projects |  |  |
| To identify documents by particular individuals |  |  |
| To identify documents from particular institutions |  |  |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature |  |  |
| To see kinds of new work being reported |  |  |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

**NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N=27)

Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 59% | 26% | 15% |
| Potential usefulness | 48% | 33% | 19% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=7)

29 % Could not readily obtain a copy
29 % Not sufficiently interested
29 % Lack of time
14 % Other

(Document 125 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

## QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | | | | 2 | |
| Selection of content/material | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | | | | 1 | |
| Organization | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

## UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 1 | 2 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 3 | | | |
| Other: To build reference library | 1 | | | |
| ________________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great

1 Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 126 NCTE/ERIC Summaries & Sources: Film Study at the Secondary Level, Robert V. Denby, November 1969. (Reprint)

NCEC Unit: Teaching of English Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: High

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=10)

### FAMILIARITY

40 % Previously Read/Skimmed

20 % Only Heard About/Seen

40 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=4)

50 % Within past month

0 % Within past 6 months

25 % Within past 3 months

25 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: Sec. Teacher: keep preparing such documents.

NON-READERS: Unclass: skimmed, but never needed to order copies.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

2 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- One or more strongly anti-film writers might have been useful. Good for its November 1969 publication but very inadequate for present use by teachers.
- Format dull and unappealing. Would not recommend document to colleagues because is outdated...if similar document were dated 1971 or 1972, would probably recommend it.
- Format somewhat difficult, particularly use of paragraphs to tie all references together.

(Document 126 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ___% No ___%

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=4)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 75% | 0% | 25% |
| Potential usefulness | 50% | 25% | 25% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=2)

0 % Could not readily obtain a copy

0 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

50 % Other

(Document 126 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | | | | 1 | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Organization | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Format | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | | |
| Other: Obtain format for periodic reviews | | 1 | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great
2 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.
1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

421

Document No. 127 NCTE/ERIC Summaries and Sources: Inservice Education for Secondary English Teachers: 'So Little Time...So Much to Learn.', Robert V. Denby, April 1970. (Reprint)

NCEC Unit: Teaching of English Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography    Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services    Visibility Index: High

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 32)

### FAMILIARITY

13 % Previously Read/Skimmed    16 % Only Heard About/Seen    72 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 4)

0 % Within past month    0 % Within past 6 months

25 % Within past 3 months    75 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: Sec. Teacher: hope ENGLISH JOURNAL continues to report summaries of research...used in my methods classes and preparation for teaching.

NON-READERS: College Prof: we already have an excellent inservice program. College Admin: doesn't pertain to my area of concentration.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

_____ Within past month    _____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months    1 More than 6 months ago

1 Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Good references...presents information not readily available to average teacher or department chairman. Was especially pleased over inclusion of several items dealing with problems in minority group education--the chief problems of our time in the field of education. Clarity and objectivity are notable features.

- Author has necessary expertise for task. Thoughtful and clear.

- References good, but a bit limited. Format adds to its clarity. Valuable as a concrete starting point for anyone interested in "Inservice Education."

(Document 127 continued)

**READER EVALUATIONS** (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Purpose of use: | | |
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

**NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N=23)

**Utility**

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 35% | 52% | 13% |
| Potential usefulness | 22% | 61% | 13% |

**Reasons for not reading:** (N=5)

0 % Could not readily obtain a copy

20 % Not sufficiently interested

20 % Lack of time

40 % Other

(Document 127 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Choice of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 3 | | | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Format | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Writing | 3 | | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | | | 1 |
| Other: __________ | | | | |
| __________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

2 Very great

1 Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

3 It is a very useful document.

_____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 128 NCTE/ERIC Summaries and Sources: Literary Analysis in Secondary English Classes, Robert V. Denby, March 1970. (Reprint)

NCEC Unit: Teaching of English Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: High

---

GENERAL FIELD SUSPEY (N= 25)

FAMILIARITY

24 % Previously Read/Skimmed

20 % Only Heard About/Seen

56 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 6)

0 % Within past month

17 % Within past 6 months

0 % Within past 3 months

83 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: was useful in preparing for my classes.

---

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=3)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

3 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Timeliness of bibliography is key to usefulness...as time passes, this document will grow less useful and more in need of updating.
- This summary would give an inexperienced, beginning, or curious teacher a start.

(Document 128 continued)

**READER EVALUATIONS** (N=

**QUALITY**

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Format | | |
| Textual material | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too many | | |
| Too few | | |

**UTILITY**

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | | |
| To identify documents on particular projects | | |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | | |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | | |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | | |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | | |

**IMPACT**

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ___% No ___%

**NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N=14)

**Utility**

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 21% | 29% | 50% |
| Potential usefulness | 7% | 29% | 64% |

**Reasons for not reading:**
(N=5)

20 % Could not readily obtain a copy
20 % Not sufficiently interested
20 % Lack of time
40 % Other

(Document 128 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 3 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | | | | 1 | |
| Interpretation | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Format | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Writing | | 3 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?
Yes 3 No ____
If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | | 3 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 3 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

1 Very great
2 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

1 It is a very useful document.
2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

427

Document No. 129 Poetry Instruction in the Elementary Grades: An NCTE/ERIC Report, Robert V. Denby, October 1969. (Reprint)

NCEC Unit: Teaching of English Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: High

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 18)

FAMILIARITY

0 % Previously Read/Skimmed

22 % Only Heard About/Seen

78 % Not Seen/Rea

RECENCY OF READING
(N=

_____% Within past month

_____% Within past 6 months

_____% Within past 3 months

_____% More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month

1 Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Format dull and unappealing.

- Fact that article was published in 1969 seems to be its greatest weakness. If subsequent abstracts were made available regularly every six or twelve months, there would be no question as to its usefulness and worth.

- Somewhat excessive attention given to analysis of form and to intellectual aspect of verse, rather than to children's subjective, aesthetic responses in poetry presented to them and in their own approaches to dictating/writing poetry.

(Document 129 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage |  |  |
| Up-to-dateness |  |  |
| Organization |  |  |
| Format |  |  |
| Textual material |  |  |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: |  |  |
| About right |  |  |
| Too many |  |  |
| Too few |  |  |

UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance |  |  |
| Need |  |  |
| Comparative usefulness |  |  |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| To identify documents on particular topics |  |  |
| To identify documents on particular projects |  |  |
| To identify documents by particular individuals |  |  |
| To identify documents from particular institutions |  |  |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature |  |  |
| To see kinds of new work being reported |  |  |

IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=14)

Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 43% | 14% | 43% |
| Potential usefulness | 36% | 14% | 50% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N=4)

25 % Could not readily obtain a copy
25 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
50 % Other

(Document 129 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | | | | 1 | |
| Interpretation | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Writing | | 2 | | | 1 | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ______

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 2 | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 3 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 2 | | |
| Other: ______________________ | | | | |
| ______________________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

_____ Very great

3 Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

1 It is a very useful document.

2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

**Document No. 130** NCTE/ERIC Report: Bilingual Education: A Special Report from CAL/ERIC, Anna Maria Malkoc and A. Hood Roberts, May 1970 (Reprint)

NCEC Unit: Teaching of English Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Special and Other Educational Groups

Visibility Index: High

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 52)

### FAMILIARITY

6 % Previously Read/Skimmed
25 % Only Heard About/Seen
69 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING (N= 3)

0 % Within past month
0 % Within past 3 months
33 % Within past 6 months
67 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: Prog. Spec: useful as member of advisory board on bilingual education in local district.

NON-READERS: College Prof: pressure of other matters carried higher priority. Elem. Teacher: can't afford everything I want.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING (N=1)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 3 months
_____ Within past 6 months
1 More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Document has two main strengths: selection of references excellent; annotations thorough and make it possible for reader to know what he needs to know about each item.

- Other references in this field would be so much more useful to anyone interested in the field, it would be foolish to reprint this.

**READER EVALUATIONS** (N=

### QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage |  |  |
| Up-to-dateness |  |  |
| Organization |  |  |
| Format |  |  |
| Textual material |  |  |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: |  |  |
| About right |  |  |
| Too many |  |  |
| Too few |  |  |

### UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance |  |  |
| Need |  |  |
| Comparative usefulness |  |  |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| To identify documents on particular topics |  |  |
| To identify documents on particular projects |  |  |
| To identify documents by particular individuals |  |  |
| To identify documents from particular institutions |  |  |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature |  |  |
| To see kinds of new work being reported |  |  |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

**NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N=36)

**Utility**

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 56% | 36% | 8% |
| Potential usefulness | 47% | 36% | 17% |

**Reasons for not reading:**
(N=13)

23 % Could not readily obtain a copy
54 % Not sufficiently interested
15 % Lack of time
8 % Other

(Document 130 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Choice of references | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Interpretation | | | 1 | | 2 | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Organization of references | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 |
| Format | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ______

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | | 2 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 2 | | 1 |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Other: ______________ | | | | |
| ______________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

3 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 131 Basic Bibliography on Handwriting, Capitalization, and Punctuation, L. Jean York, December 1969.

NCEC Unit: Teaching of English Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 11)

FAMILIARITY

0 % Previously Read/Skimmed
9 % Only Heard About/Seen
91 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=

_____% Within past month
_____% Within past 6 months
_____% Within past 3 months
_____% More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month
_____ Within past 6 months
_____ Within past 3 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- A subject about which not too much research is done. Should, I feel, remain in ERIC because it is unique. Needs to be updated...is valid as far as it goes.

- Title misleading...heavy preponderance of entries treats handwriting...only one entry treats capitalization, and one is really about composition rather than handwriting.

- Title misleading...contains many references to articles on handwriting, some on punctuation, none on capitalization (all listed in title), some on spelling (not in title). Format clear, easy to read. Writing simple, straightforward. At first quite disinterested in the document's subject matter, but reading it quickly and effectively convinced me of the importance of the subject and the value of the document. A worthwhile experience!

(Document 131 continued)

**READER EVALUATIONS** (N=

QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage |  |  |
| Up-to-dateness |  |  |
| Organization |  |  |
| Format |  |  |
| Textual material |  |  |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No. of references: |  |  |
| About right |  |  |
| Too many |  |  |
| Too few |  |  |

UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance |  |  |
| Need |  |  |
| Comparative usefulness |  |  |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| To identify documents on particular topics |  |  |
| To identify documents on particular projects |  |  |
| To identify documents by particular individuals |  |  |
| To identify documents from particular institutions |  |  |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature |  |  |
| To see kinds of new work being reported |  |  |

IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes ____% No ____%

**NON-READER EVALUATIONS** (N= 10)

Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 10% | 50% | 30% |
| Potential usefulness | 20% | 30% | 40% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N= 1)

0 % Could not readily obtain a copy
100 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
0 % Other

(Document 131 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | | | | 1 | |
| Selection of content/material | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Inclusion of current material | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | | | | 1 | |
| Interpretation | | | 1 | | 2 | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Organization of references | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| Look up facts | 2 | | | 1 |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | | 3 | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | | 3 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 2 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

____ Very great

3 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

1 It is a very useful document.

2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 132 Elective English Programs in Junior and Senior High Schools, Linda A. Kubicek (Compi~~ler~~), September 1970. (ED 041 182)

NCEC Unit: Teaching of English Clearinghouse

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper — Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content — Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=37)

### FAMILIARITY

8 % Previously Read/Skimmed

16 % Only Heard About/Seen

76 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=3)

0 % Within past month

33 % Within past 3 months

33 % Within past 6 months

33 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: Prog. Spec: helped me to show English teachers national movement toward more electives for English students.

NON-READERS: College Prof: is on my "must-read" file (in microfiche) waiting the day I finish my thesis.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

1 Within past 6 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Sampling a small one, but material presented is useful.
- Very valuable.
- Should be very helpful to schools attempting to move into elective, non-graded programs. One striking observation is paucity of courses for slow or unmotivated student, and preponderance of courses for superior or academically talented.

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 28)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 61% | 31% | 7% |
| Potential usefulness | 46% | 36% | 14% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N= 6)

50 % Could not readily obtain a copy

0 % Not sufficiently interested

17 % Lack of time

17 % Other

(Document 132 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Selection of content/material | | 3 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | | | | 1 | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Interpretation | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Format | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | | 2 | | | 1 | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| Obtain new knowledge | 3 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

3 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

3 It is a very useful document.

____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 133 Recommended English Curriculum Guides K-12 and Criteria for Planning and Evaluation: 1970, William J. Scannell, November 1970. (ED 044 419)

NCEC Unit: Teaching of English Clearinghouse

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content Visibility Index: High

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=88)

FAMILIARITY

9 % Previously Read/Skimmed 10 % Only Heard About/Seen 81 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=8)

0 % Within past month 25 % Within past 6 months

0 % Within past 3 months 75 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Prog. Spec: by using, was able to select and order samples of curriculum guides for reference for myself and my school. College Prof: useful for securing ordering data. Prog. Spec: isn't there a revision of this?...was particularly well-written...a pleasure to read from standpoint of writing style. Sec. Teacher: continue preparation of such documents...keep them as current as possible.

NON-READERS: Elem. Teacher: saw it listed in Elementary English.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

____ Within past month ____ Within past 6 months

1 Within past 3 months 1 More than 6 months ago

____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- This service of NCTE seems to be a valuable one to the profession...its report in ERIC extends this usefulness. Our staff uses the material with teachers.

- Biases of committee clear and well-stated; thus, recommendations easier to interpret.

(Document 133 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 71)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 51% | 34% | 14% |
| Potential usefulness | 45% | 31% | 23% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N= 9)

67 % Could not readily obtain a copy
0 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
22 % Other

(Document 133 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | | | | | |
| Organization | 2 | | | | | |
| Organization of references | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Writing | 2 | | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | 2 | | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | | | 1 |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | | | |
| Other: ______________ | | | | |
| ______________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

2 Very great

_____ Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

2 It is a very useful document.

_____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 134 Teaching Literature in the Elementary School, NCTE/ERIC Studies in the Teaching of English, Norine Odland, July 1969. (ED031 482)

NCEC Unit: Teaching of English Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 50)

FAMILIARITY

6 % Previously Read/Skimmed

12 % Only Heard About/Seen

82 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 3)

0 % Within past month

0 % Within past 6 months

0 % Within past 3 months

100 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: tended to confirm personal opinion.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

2 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Very good document; very clear presentation. Is an area that is growing and needs help. Feel document would be very useful to students of Children's Literature...gives directions to go from.

- Dull. Seems to lament stuffy, dead, philological/historical practices, as the enemies of children and literature.

- Unique...no one else has attempted to gather these kinds of data. It is, however, already seriously outdated.

(Document 134 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=47)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 45% | 38% | 17% |
| Potential usefulness | 30% | 43% | 26% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=6)

33 % Could not readily obtain a copy

50 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

0 % Other

(Document 134 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Organization | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No 1

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | 1 | 1 | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | | 2 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

3 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 135 Creativity in the English Program, NCTE/ERIC Studies in the Teaching of English, Rodney P. Smith, Jr., April 1970. (ED 038 413)

NCEC Unit: Teaching of English Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Medium*

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Medium

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 48)

### FAMILIARITY

4 % Previously Read/Skimmed

4 % Only Heard About/Seen

92 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING (N= 2)

50 % Within past month

0 % Within past 6 months

0 % Within past 3 months

50 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING (N=1)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

1 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- [References] one of the real strengths of document. Have used this for inservice work quite extensively during past two years and have found it useful. Not "scholarly," but is based on scholarship that needs application for the teacher.

- Material well chosen. Eliminates much that is peripheral. Bibliographic references excellent. Document brings together most of the research pertinent to English. Organization would make it easy for teachers to use.

- Overlooked a great deal of very useful research. Document quite well done but became outdated very rapidly at the rate developments are moving.

(Document 135 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 46)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 57% | 35% | 9% |
| Potential usefulness | 48% | 41% | 11% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N= 2)

| | |
|---|---|
| 0 % | Could not readily obtain a copy |
| 50 % | Not sufficiently interested |
| 0 % | Lack of time |
| 0 % | Other |

(Document 135 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

## QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization | 2 | | | | | 1 |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

## UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | | | 1 |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____ | | | | |
| ____ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great

1 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 136 Developing Criterion-Referenced Tests, Rex Jackson, June 1970. (ED 041 052)

NCEC Unit: Tests, Measurement, and Evaluation Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 233)

### FAMILIARITY

20 % Previously Read/Skimmed

15 % Only Heard About/Seen

65 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 47)

21 % Within past month

23 % Within past 6 months

26 % Within past 3 months

30 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: Researcher: used to compile an annotated bibliography. Researcher: affected policy recommended to State Commissioner of Education. Unclass: stimulated me to work in the area. College Prof: improved quality of my course work presentations in measurement and evaluation. College Admin: topic is excellent...treatment is shoddy...cited article to staff to encourage further work to overcome the superficial knowledge related in the article. Researcher: needs broader scope and more examples.

NON-READERS: Researcher: loaned copy and has not been returned. Other Admin: have requested but not yet received. Researcher: didn't know about it at the time, now I'll read it. Supervisor: recommended it to counseling department for consideration. Researcher: deferred reading until more directly relevant to what I'm doing.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Useful for summarizing topic for experts, not to aid interested novice.

- Seems like textbook chapter, but little wordy for this. Does not merely concern achievement tests as stated, also applies to aptitude measurement. Good but no new ideas.

- Conclusions more abstruse and negative than presentation warrants...article, in general, is useful. Introduction needed to outline scope and intent of paper...could use more titles and sub-titles.

(Document 136 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=47)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.51 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.83 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.28 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.57 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.77 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.28 | (2.32) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 96% | (82%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 4% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.83 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.38 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.49 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.64 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.09 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.00 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.15 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.43 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.17 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 28% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 72% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 38% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 32% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 2% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 38% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 186)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 60% | 32% | 8% |
| Potential usefulness | 40% | 38% | 16% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=34)

47 % Could not readily obtain a copy

26 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

24 % Other

(Document 136 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Selection of content/material | | 3 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Inclusion of current material | | 3 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Organization | 1 | | 2 | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Format | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | | 2 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 3 | | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Other: Aid in designing tests | 1 | | | |
| | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

____ Very great
3 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

1 It is a very useful document.
2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 137 Work Experience for Broadening Occupational Offerings: A Selected Bibliography for Use in Program Development, Information, David McCracken, November 1969. (ED 034 062)

NCEC Unit: Vocational and Technical Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Bibliography

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Low

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 123)

### FAMILIARITY

12 % Previously Read/Skimmed  20 % Only Heard About/Seen  68 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 15)

13 % Within past month

40 % Within past 6 months

20 % Within past 3 months

27 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

NON-READERS: Vocational Educator: material did not specifically relate to female students. Superintendent: have sent for it, not received to date. Vocational Educator: we were not in position to engage in broad work experience program, although we have one in operation with certain programs.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Review and analysis very good; summary excellent. More current references needed. Too much emphasis on disadvantaged...not enough references covering average or talented individual. Very useful as reference for college students and teacher educators...practitioner would want more guidelines.

- Attempt to review and analyze 30 selected references in one and one-half pages... whereas publication may be satisfactory as a bibliography, it is not suitable as a "review and analysis."

- More in-depth treatment of "Review and Analysis" section would add to usefulness of document. Not enough facts presented.

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=15)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.47 | (2.49) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.73 | (2.78) |
| Organization | 2.07 | (2.23) |
| Format | 2.53 | (2.72) |
| Textual material | 2.33 | (2.47) |

| No. of references: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| About right | 87% | (81%) |
| Too many | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too few | 0% | (11%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.80 | (2.77) |
| Need | 2.47 | (2.39) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.53 | (2.70) |

| Purpose of use: | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| To identify documents on particular topics | 80% | (73%) |
| To identify documents on particular projects | 47% | (41%) |
| To identify documents by particular individuals | 13% | (13%) |
| To identify documents from particular institutions | 7% | (11%) |
| To perform comprehensive search of literature | 73% | (55%) |
| To see kinds of new work being reported | 67% | (67%) |

### IMPACT

Were cited documents examined? Yes 14 (93%)

Was content of cited document(s) as expected from bibliographic reference? Yes 87 % No 13 %

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=84)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 37% | 54% | 10% |
| Potential usefulness | 19% | 57% | 24% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=24)

29 % Could not readily obtain a copy
21 % Not sufficiently interested
8 % Lack of time
29 % Other

(Document 137 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

## QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Selection of content/material | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | | 2 | | | |
| Interpretation | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | | 3 | | | | |

## UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Look up facts | 1 | | 2 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | | 3 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 2 | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | 2 | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | | 1 | |
| Other: ____ | | | | |
| ____ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great

2 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

1 It is a very useful document.

2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 138 An Application of Research: Working with Opinion Leaders to Accelerate Change in Vocational-Technical Education, Garry R. Bice, November 1970. (ED 044 502)

NCEC Unit: Vocational and Technical Education

Product Type: Practical Guidance Paper

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=111)

FAMILIARITY

14 % Previously Read/Skimmed

14 % Only Heard About/Seen

72 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=15)

7 % Within past month

27 % Within past 6 months

27 % Within past 3 months

40 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Instr. Resources Spec: more targeted documents of this nature are needed by educators at all levels.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Document a good starting point for someone wishing to utilize opinion leadership to promote change; would not be completely adequate as a handbook. Reference choices good...range from "classical" to the more recent.

- Reference choices good although limited. Should have mentioned innovation phenomena in other fields. Summaries and generalizations helpful and time saving.

- Very useful and direct. Avoids detail which might hinder acceptance.

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=15)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.40 | (2.43) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.73 | (2.77) |
| Organization | 2.27 | (2.33) |
| Writing | 2.33 | (2.53) |
| Format | 2.67 | (2.74) |
| Discussion | 2.20 | (2.30) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 80% | (83%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 13% | ( 8%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.60 | (2.67) |
| Need | 2.20 | (2.35) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.53 | (2.52) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.53 | (2.54) |
| Look up facts | 2.27 | (2.24) |
| Identify individuals | 2.20 | (2.12) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.40 | (2.26) |
| Update knowledge | 2.27 | (2.41) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.13 | (2.18) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 33% | (23%) |
| Applied in my work | 80% | (65%) |
| Used to give advice | 53% | (49%) |
| Examined other documents | 40% | (27%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 13% | ( 6%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 40% | (50%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=80)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 32% | 51% | 16% |
| Potential usefulness | 27% | 50% | 20% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=16)

31 % Could not readily obtain a copy
38 % Not sufficiently interested
6 % Lack of time
13 % Other

(Document 138 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | | 3 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

3 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 139 Review and Synthesis of Research on Vocational Education in Rural Areas, B. Eugene Griessman & Kenneth G. Densley, December 1969. (ED 034 632)

NCEC Unit: Vocational and Technical Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=64)

FAMILIARITY

28 % Previously Read/Skimmed

8 % Only Heard About/Seen

64 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 18)

6 % Within past month

17 % Within past 6 months

6 % Within past 3 months

72 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Principal: gave background for design of a vocational education program. Researcher: would have liked synthetical review, not separate analyses...the latter we already have. College Prof: obtain synthesizers who are recognized for contributions in this area by having adequate research experience and several years of special involvement in the topic. Researcher: relatively low quality work.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=0)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Materials readable and well organized. Very useful reference.

- Too many statistics and references. Too long...could be condensed and still serve purpose. Many references quoted old.

- Some repetition of facts could have been avoided. Question value for effectiveness of some of the charts and illustrations. Seems to be room for more study in this area. Much that has not been said relating to rural areas and vocational education needs.

(Document 139 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N= 18)

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.22 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.72 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.11 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.17 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.78 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.11 | (2.32) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 83% | (82%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 6% | (10%) |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.72 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.22 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.39 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.61 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.00 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.06 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.33 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.56 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.00 | (2.14) |

IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 17% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 72% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 33% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 39% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 0% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 56% | (46%) |

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 46)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 33% | 39% | 28% |
| Potential usefulness | 20% | 35% | 37% |

Reasons for not reading:
(N= 5)

60 % Could not readily obtain a copy
20 % Not sufficiently interested
0 % Lack of time
20 % Other

(Document 139 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

## QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

## UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 2 | | |
| Other: Principles and philosophy | 1 | | | |
| __________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great

1 Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

1 It is a very useful document.

2 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 140 Review and Synthesis of Research: Analysis for Curriculum Development in Vocational Education, Milton E. Larson, October 1969. (ED 035 746)

NCEC Unit: Vocational and Technical Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Medium

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 146)

### FAMILIARITY

23 % Previously Read/Skimmed

12 % Only Heard About/Seen

64 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 34)

3 % Within past month

38 % Within past 6 months

18 % Within past 3 months

41 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: College Prof: assisted in curriculum development. Prog. Spec: helped in proposal development. Prog. Spec: used for new school personnel with poor knowledge of vocational education. Other Admin: to make recommendations on our career and vocational education programs. Supervisor: use it frequently as resource even though it is 3 or 4 years old. Principal: excellent information...very useful for person needing an analysis.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

1 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Should be used in all teacher training courses.
- Have used considerably during last year. Would be of more value if updated.
- Very readable report, very useful. Can only make aware...details must be gained by further study.

(Document 140 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=34)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.50 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.88 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.38 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.53 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.71 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.26 | (2.32) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 97% | (82%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 0% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.68 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.35 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.74 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.71 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.29 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.18 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.65 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.59 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.15 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 41% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 79% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 44% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 47% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 9% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 56% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=112)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 56% | 28% | 16% |
| Potential usefulness | 47% | 30% | 20% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=18)

28 % Could not readily obtain a copy
33 % Not sufficiently interested
17 % Lack of time
6 % Other

(Document 140 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

## QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

## UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

| | Usefulness for Various Purposes | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 3 | | | |
| Update knowledge | | 3 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 2 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

2 Very great

1 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

3 It is a very useful document.

____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 141 Review and Synthesis of Research on the Placement and Follow-up of Vocational Education Students, Research Series No. 49, J. Kenneth Little, February 1970. (ED 037 543)

NCEC Unit: Vocational and Technical Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 99 )

FAMILIARITY

22 % Previously Read/Skimmed

13 % Only Heard About/Seen

63 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 22)

5 % Within past month

18 % Within past 6 months

41 % Within past 3 months

36 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

READERS: Researcher: to be truly "syntheses" they should be funded to provide in-depth analyses to explain differences in reported variations in the dependent variables...level of funding for these should be substantially increased. College Prof: of general interest, not related directly to my needs. Superintendent: particular interest in cost-benefit studies.

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month

1 Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Would need to be updated at periodic intervals. Excellent source of data about placement. I use this document with graduate students.
- State-of-the-art reports would be used more if only high points and "use" indicators were included...a little too wordy.
- Material organized logically by topic and field. Future researchers would benefit from observations and recommendations made in summary section.

(Document 141 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=22)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.41 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.73 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.27 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.41 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.77 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.23 | (2.32) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 77% | (82%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 9% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.68 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.36 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.50 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.59 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.36 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.05 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.32 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.36 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.09 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 18% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 68% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 36% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 36% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 14% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 55% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=77)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 56% | 35% | 9% |
| Potential usefulness | 44% | 32% | 17% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=13)

46 % Could not readily obtain a copy

46 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

0 % Other

(Document 141 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | | | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | 3 | | | | | |
| Interpretation | 3 | | | | | |
| Organization | 3 | | | | | |
| Organization of references | 3 | | | | | |
| Format | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

**Usefulness for Various Purposes**

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 3 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 3 | | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

3 Very great

____ Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

3 It is a very useful document.

____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 142 Review and Synthesis of Research in Trade and Industrial Education, Albert J. Paulter and Carl J. Schaefer, Sept. 1969. (ED 036 638)

NCEC Unit: Vocational and Technical Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Medium

---

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=59)

FAMILIARITY

20 % Previously Read/Skimmed  12 % Only Heard About/Seen  68 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=12)

0 % Within past month

42 % Within past 6 months

17 % Within past 3 months

42 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

---

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

1 More than 6 months ago

1 Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- An excellent reference tool. Would be beneficial to have more detailed description of sample and setting on research reported.
- Curriculum development section is weak. Need to emphasize occupational analysis, source of performance standards, and derivation of terminal behavior objectives.
- Material relevant at time of publication...should be updated annually.

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage |  |  |
| Up-to-dateness |  |  |
| Organization |  |  |
| Writing |  |  |
| Format |  |  |
| Discussion |  |  |

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: |  |  |
| About right |  |  |
| Too long |  |  |
| Too short |  |  |

### UTILITY

|  | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance |  |  |
| Need |  |  |
| Comparative usefulness |  |  |
| Purpose of use: |  |  |
| Obtain overview |  |  |
| Look up facts |  |  |
| Identify individuals |  |  |
| Identify relevant literature |  |  |
| Update knowledge |  |  |
| Obtain new knowledge |  |  |

### IMPACT

|  | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision |  |  |
| Applied in my work |  |  |
| Used to give advice |  |  |
| Examined other documents |  |  |
| Consulted with author(s) or others |  |  |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) |  |  |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=47)

### Utility

|  | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 43% | 45% | 13% |
| Potential usefulness | 36% | 34% | 21% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=7)

57 % Could not readily obtain a copy
14 % Not sufficiently interested
14 % Lack of time
0 % Other

(Document 142 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Writing | | 2 | 1 | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 3 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 2 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

1 Very great

2 Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

3 It is a very useful document.

_____ It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 143 Review and Synthesis of Research in Business and Office Education, Ray G. Price & Charles R. Hopkins, April 1970. (ED 038 520)

NCEC Unit: Vocational and Technical Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: High

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Medium

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=36)

FAMILIARITY

14 % Previously Read/Skimmed

14 % Only Heard About/Seen

72 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 5)

20 % Within past month

0 % Within past 6 months

20 % Within past 3 months

60 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=2)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month

1 Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Items not addressed to major problem of "vocationalizing" business education. Material has generally appeared in other publications. Project descriptions and conclusions effectively summarized.
- Reviews should appear every 1-2 years...should be developed by team of specialists under coordination of one business educator.

(Document 143 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=31)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 32% | 45% | 23% |
| Potential usefulness | 32% | 35% | 26% |

### Reasons for not reading: (N=5)

60 % Could not readily obtain a copy

40 % Not sufficiently interested

0 % Lack of time

0 % Other

(Document 143 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=2)

## QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | | | 1 | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | | | | | |
| Accuracy | 2 | | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Organization | 2 | | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| Writing | 1 | 1 | | | | |

## UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 No _____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | | | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 1 | | |
| Other: ____________________ | | | | |
| ____________________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

1 Very great

1 Moderately great

_____ Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

1 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

_____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 144 Review and Synthesis of Research in Technical Education, Donald S. Phillips and Lloyd D. Briggs, October 1969. (ED 036 639)

NCEC Unit: Vocational and Technical Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=102)

FAMILIARITY

18 % Previously Read/Skimmed 15 % Only Heard About/Seen 68 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N= 18)

6 % Within past month 56 % Within past 6 months

6 % Within past 3 months 33 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month _____ Within past 6 months

_____ Within past 3 months 1 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Reviews but does not synthesize the literature...presents straightforward description without any evaluation. Would have been equally valuable (and an important effort) had it been an annotated bibliography.

- As of 1969, it was great...should be updated.

- Data discussed could have been researched by anyone in the field through the ERIC system...survey of this type offers little opportunity for originality. Clear in presentation of material but too brief for real usefulness.

(Document 144 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N= 18)

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | 2.28 | (2.50) |
| Up-to-dateness | 2.67 | (2.81) |
| Organization | 2.17 | (2.31) |
| Writing | 2.39 | (2.51) |
| Format | 2.61 | (2.72) |
| Discussion | 2.17 | (2.32) |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | 94% | (82%) |
| Too long | 0% | ( 4%) |
| Too short | 0% | (10%) |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 2.61 | (2.72) |
| Need | 2.06 | (2.33) |
| Comparative usefulness | 2.72 | (2.58) |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | 2.61 | (2.63) |
| Look up facts | 2.00 | (2.20) |
| Identify individuals | 2.22 | (2.13) |
| Identify relevant literature | 2.44 | (2.36) |
| Update knowledge | 2.33 | (2.47) |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2.11 | (2.14) |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | 0% | (19%) |
| Applied in my work | 78% | (69%) |
| Used to give advice | 17% | (42%) |
| Examined other documents | 39% | (32%) |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | 6% | ( 8%) |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | 50% | (46%) |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N=84)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 27% | 44% | 27% |
| Potential usefulness | 24% | 40% | 32% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=15)

20 % Could not readily obtain a copy

33 % Not sufficiently interested

13 % Lack of time

7 % Other

(Document 144 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 2 | | | | 1 |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Organization | | 3 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Format | 2 | | | | 1 | |
| Writing | | 3 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 2 . No 1

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 1 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 1 | | |
| Update knowledge | | 2 | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | | 1 | |
| Other: ________ | | | | |
| ________ | | | | |

Need for Document of This Type

2 Very great

___ Moderately great

1 Not at all great

Overall Usefulness of Document

1 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

1 Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 145 Review and Synthesis of Research and Developmental Activities Concerning State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education, Joseph R. Clary, September 1970. (ED 043 744)

NCEC Unit: Vocational and Technical Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Medium

Subject Cluster: Educational Administration and Services

Visibility Index: Medium

## GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N= 74)

### FAMILIARITY

12 % Previously Read/Skimmed
18 % Only Heard About/Seen
70 % Not Seen/Read

### RECENCY OF READING
(N= 9)

0 % Within past month
11 % Within past 6 months
22 % Within past 3 months
67 % More than 6 months ago

### COMMENTS

READERS: Vocational Educator: was particularly useful as I am a member of State Advisory Council. Researcher: assisted me in developing background to work with State Advisory Council.

NON-READERS: Researcher: descriptive report containing little analytical content.

## SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

### RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

_____ Within past month
2 Within past 6 months
_____ Within past 3 months
_____ More than 6 months ago
_____ Cannot recall

### COMMENTS

- Author has fine background. Good compilation of materials on subject at time of publishing. Shorter paragraph break-down would facilitate reading and item location.

- Document reported on topic of great change...strongly recommend updating as councils are beginning to do purposeful work.

- Topic is timely and document similar to this urgently needed. Publication preceded first written reports of many Councils...review of research is a poor series for a topic that is new and not yet researched...should be rewritten in different format. Materials were most limited...good job of locating much unpublished material.

(Document 145 continued)

READER EVALUATIONS (N=

QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 65)

Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 29% | 51% | 18% |
| Potential usefulness | 15% | 42% | 32% |

Reasons for not reading: (N= 13)

8 % Could not readily obtain a copy
54 % Not sufficiently interested
15 % Lack of time
23 % Other

(Document 145 continued)

## SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

### QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Format | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | | | | |

### UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?
Yes 3 No ____
If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Identify relevant literature | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 2 | | 1 | |
| Update knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 2 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

2 Very great
1 Moderately great
____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

2 It is a very useful document.
1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.
____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.

Document No. 146 Interpretation of Literature on Career Ladders and Lattices in Health Occupations Education, Jean Kintgen, Sept. 1970. (ED 042 919)

NCEC Unit: Vocational and Technical Education Clearinghouse

Product Type: Review

Level of Effort Index: Low

Subject Cluster: Instructional Content

Visibility Index: Low

GENERAL FIELD SURVEY (N=44)

FAMILIARITY

5 % Previously Read/Skimmed

11 % Only Heard About/Seen

84 % Not Seen/Read

RECENCY OF READING
(N=2)

100 % Within past month

0 % Within past 3 months

0 % Within past 6 months

0 % More than 6 months ago

COMMENTS

SPECIALISTS' SURVEY (N=3)

RECENCY OF READING
(N=1)

_____ Within past month

_____ Within past 3 months

_____ Within past 6 months

1 More than 6 months ago

_____ Cannot recall

COMMENTS

- Although title caused anticipation of more in-depth "interpretation," there is great value to busy reader in brief, well-stated, and well-organized paragraphs.

- Job position of author makes good choice. Content as defined by scope of work, very good. "Interpretation" section weakest. Introduction well prepared.

- Little interpretation in the "Interpretation" section.

(Document 146 continued)

## READER EVALUATIONS (N=

### QUALITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Coverage | | |
| Up-to-dateness | | |
| Organization | | |
| Writing | | |
| Format | | |
| Discussion | | |

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Length: | | |
| About right | | |
| Too long | | |
| Too short | | |

### UTILITY

| | Mean | Reference Mean |
|---|---|---|
| Relevance | | |
| Need | | |
| Comparative usefulness | | |
| Purpose of use: | | |
| Obtain overview | | |
| Look up facts | | |
| Identify individuals | | |
| Identify relevant literature | | |
| Update knowledge | | |
| Obtain new knowledge | | |

### IMPACT

| | Percentage | Reference Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Used to make decision | | |
| Applied in my work | | |
| Used to give advice | | |
| Examined other documents | | |
| Consulted with author(s) or others | | |
| Passed document on to colleague(s) | | |

## NON-READER EVALUATIONS (N= 42)

### Utility

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance | 31% | 38% | 31% |
| Potential usefulness | 21% | 40% | 36% |

### Reasons for not reading:
(N=5)

20 % Could not readily obtain a copy

40 % Not sufficiently interested

20 % Lack of time

20 % Other

(Document 146 continued)

SPECIALISTS' EVALUATIONS (N=3)

QUALITY

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Not Applicable | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice of author | | 3 | | | | |
| Selection of content/material | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| Choice of references | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| Inclusion of current material | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Accuracy | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Interpretation | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Organization | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Organization of references | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Format | | 2 | | | | 1 |
| Writing | 2 | 1 | | | | |

UTILITY

Would you recommend to colleagues?

Yes 3 No ____

If yes:

Usefulness for Various Purposes

| Purpose of Use | Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not At All Useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Obtain overview | 2 | 1 | | |
| Look up facts | 1 | 2 | | |
| Identify relevant literature | 2 | 1 | | |
| Identify individuals or institutions | 1 | 2 | | |
| Update knowledge | 2 | | 1 | |
| Obtain new knowledge | 2 | | 1 | |
| Obtain practical guidance | 1 | 2 | | |
| Other: ____________ | | | | |
| ____________ | | | | |

**Need for Document of This Type**

1 Very great

2 Moderately great

____ Not at all great

**Overall Usefulness of Document**

2 It is a very useful document.

1 It is not unusually useful, but it is worth having available.

____ Its usefulness is too limited to justify its publication.